





2 vols





THE  
PROTESTANT,

A SERIES OF ESSAYS

ON THE

PRINCIPAL POINTS OF CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE

*Church of Rome*

AND

THE REFORMED.

VOL. III.

TENTH EDITION.

GLASGOW:  
BLACKIE & SON, 38, QUEEN STREET;  
5, SOUTH COLLEGE STREET, EDINBURGH;  
AND 21, WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON

---

MDCCCXXXVII

1817

THE A. T. & S. CO.

PRINTED BY THE A. T. & S. CO.



THE A. T. & S. CO. PRINTED BY THE A. T. & S. CO.

THE A. T. & S. CO. PRINTED BY THE A. T. & S. CO.

THE A. T. & S. CO. PRINTED BY THE A. T. & S. CO.

THE A. T. & S. CO. PRINTED BY THE A. T. & S. CO.

THE A. T. & S. CO. PRINTED BY THE A. T. & S. CO.

THE A. T. & S. CO. PRINTED BY THE A. T. & S. CO.

GEORGE BROOKMAN, PRINTER, GLASGOW.

# CONTENTS

OF

## VOLUME THIRD.

	Page
No. CV. Papal usurpation. Bishop Hay on the headship of Peter, and the Pope. His doctrine refuted. Creed of Pope Pius IV. which is the standard of Roman orthodoxy.....	1
CVI. The Pope's excommunication of the French Emperor.....	9
CVII. The same continued. Remarks upon it.....	17
CVIII. Remarks continued. Mode of electing a Pope. Case of Sixtus V. Character of a number of the Popes.....	25
CIX. Number of Catholics in England, and their rank. Consequence that would follow of their being admitted into parliament. Introduction of Christianity into Britain. Wales.....	33
CX. Calculation of the number of Papists in Glasgow. Mr. Cleland's report vindicated. Reasons why a priest will not write against a layman. Letter from "a lover of truth," in Greenock. Letter II. from W. D. a Papist.....	41
CXI. Remarks on W. D.'s letter. Sects and differences of opinion in the Church of Rome, notwithstanding her pretended unity.....	49
CXII. Farther remarks on W. D.'s letter. Showing that a man cannot honestly serve Christ in the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome establishes iniquity by law. Extract from the life of John Craig.....	57
CXIII. Controversy between the Bishop of Durham and some English Papists. Correspondence between Dr. Troy of Dublin, and the Secretaries of the Sunday School Union. Remarks. Andrews' school book.....	65
CXIV. Letter from a clergyman in Ireland. Instance of conversion from Popery. Austerities of pilgrims at holy places. Character of several Popish publications.....	73
CXV. Introduction to the subject of clerical celibacy. Doctrine as laid down by Bishop Hay. Shown to be unscriptural. His sophistry exposed.....	81
CXVI. Celibacy continued. The arguments of Popish writers in favour of it exposed. Shocking immoralities occasioned by it.....	89
CXVII. Profligacy of the Romish clergy. They openly kept concubines. Proofs of this from Henry's History of Britain. Proved by other authors.....	97
CXVIII. Clerical celibacy. Anecdotes relating to it. Letter from "A friend to fair dealing." Remarks by way of answer. Letter from "An Irishman".....	105
CXIX. Long letter from Juvenis, a Papist. Remarks upon it.....	113
CXX. Farther remarks on Juvenis' Letter. Return to Amicus Veritatis. His observations about Luther, and good works exposed. Justification by faith.....	121

	Page
CXXI. Luther and good works. Impudence of Popish writers in reference to the Reformer. Origin of Popery in the self-righteous bias of the human heart. The opening of Luther's mind to the truth. Justification by faith the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation.....	129
CXXII. Amicus Veritatis on the subject of satisfying divine justice. Absurd and antichristian doctrine taught by Papists. Luther's doctrine and life. Absurd stories reported in relation to his death...	157
CXXIII. State of Ireland. Extracts of letters on this subject. Method of keeping Lent.....	145
CXXIV. The Inquisition introduced. Horrible cruelty of it. Sufferings of the Albigenses and Waldenses. Limborch. His history, and his character.....	153
CXXV. More of the Inquisition. Crusade against the Waldenses. Jones' History of the Waldenses quoted and recommended.....	161
CXXVI. Origin and growth of the Inquisition. Heresy the chief object of its pursuit and vengeance. Galileo persecuted by the Inquisition for teaching that the earth moved round the sun. He is compelled to recant.....	169
CXXVII. Breaking up of the Inquisition at Saragosa, by French troops. Sixty young women found in the keeping of the holy fathers. Singular narrative of one of them.....	177
CXXVIII. Narrative of a young lady found in the Inquisition continued. Mode of recruiting the holy Seraglio. More of the horrid cruelty of the holy office.....	185
CXXIX. Auto-da-fè. More of the Inquisition. Sufferings of Isaac Martin. Paris massacre. Irish massacre in 1641. Annals of Ireland, by the Rev. John Graham.....	195
CXXX. Revocation of the edict of Nantz, and the consequences. Impudence and falsehood of Bossuet, bishop of Meaux. Amicus Veritatis again comes into view. His complaint of persecution. The bishop of Meaux arguing the lawfulness of persecution.....	201
CXXXI. Juvenis on the word <i>πρωτος</i> , and Peter's supremacy. Exposure of his mistakes.....	209
CXXXII. Farther reply to Juvenis. Sufficiency of the Bible.....	217
CXXXIII. The same subject continued. The Catholic Vindicator quoted, and answered, in reference to the sufficiency of the Bible...	225
CXXXIV. How a Christian knows the Bible to be the word of God independently of human tradition. Recommendation of a late pamphlet by Thomas Erskine, Esq. Advocate.....	235
CXXXV. <i>Bellum Papale</i> . Errors in the Pope's edition of the Bible. Letter on the state of Popery in Ireland, by J. A.....	241
CXXXVI. Extreme Unction. Doctrine laid down by Bishop Hay. Subject discussed.....	249
CXXXVII. Extreme Unction continued. Shown to have no foundation in Scripture, in the sense in which Papists use it.....	257
CXXXVIII. The Jesuits. Extract of a letter relating to them, and The Protestant. Efforts of Jesuits in Lancashire. Petition of an Independent church for "Catholic emancipation." Remarks on it. Extract of a letter relating to the Jesuits.....	265
CXXXIX. The Jesuits continued. Letter relating to a society in Preston. Remarks on the acts of the Jesuits there. <i>Liberality</i> of Protestants in Manchester. "Modes of faith," discussed.....	273
CXL. Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits' Order. Strange stories of him. Compared with Luther. Dr. Robertson's account of the Order. Story of one Heth.....	281
CXLI. Dallas' defence of the Jesuits noticed. Decline and fall of the order. Their revival by the present Pope.....	289



# CONTENTS.

vii

	Page
CXLII. Letter from Preston. <i>Secreta Monita</i> , or secret rules of the Jesuits.....	297
CXLIII. <i>Secreta Monita</i> continued. Intrigues of the Jesuits. Their oath of secrecy.....	305
CXLIV. A hint about Catholic emancipation. Recommendation of letters by PHILOPATRIS, and letters to Mr. Wilberforce, in the Morning Post. Another letter from J. A. on the state of Popery in Ireland.....	312
CXLV. Berington and Kirk's work introduced. Remarks on its title. Absurdity of supposing wicked men in the priesthood infallible teachers of a holy religion. Some of the propositions of B. and K. discussed.....	321
CXLVI. More of Berington and Kirk. More of their errors pointed out. An old story versified by the Rev. John Graham.....	329
CXLVII. A curious document from Rome, received from a correspondent, with a translation. Remarks on it.....	337
CXLVIII. Rome in the 19th century. Irish miracles. Continuation of a letter by J. A. Remarks on it, and on Maynooth College. Recipe for making Italian soup. Prayer of the king of France to the Virgin Mary.....	345
CXLIX. Reply to Amicus Veritatis resumed. His misrepresentations and absurdities exposed.....	353
CL. Farther exposure of Amicus Veritatis. Defence of Luther's doctrine relating to divorce. Amicus challenged to prove his allegations against Luther, Knox, and others.....	361
CLI. Commencement of Reply to the Catholic Vindicator. Character of this writer and of his work. A few of his absurdities exposed.....	369
CLII. The Vindicator admits the word Papist. Dr. Geddes' distinction between Catholic and Papist. More of the Vindicator's absurdities pointed out.....	377
CLIII. Reply to the Vindicator continued. He asserts that Christianity owes its rise to the influence of Popery. His allegation that Popery is more favourable to good morals than Protestantism discussed.....	385
CLIV. The Vindicator's notice of Bourke's pamphlet. His assertion that the Covenanters became bound to extirpate Papists by force of arms, shown to be false. Slanders propagated in Preston against The Protestant. The Pope crowning Buonaparte admitted by the Vindicator. Remarks thereon. Reasons why the Pope cannot permit his subjects to take the oath of supremacy, and the declaration against transubstantiation.....	393
CLV. Reply to the Vindicator on the subject of not keeping faith with heretics. His defence shown to be irrelevant, and the doctrine confirmed as a Popish tenet. Short notice of the cause between the Popish priest and The Protestant, decided in the Jury Court.....	401
CLVI. Farther account of the trial. Slandrous language of the Catholic Vindicator exposed. Reasons why Papists are incapable of holding places of power and trust.....	409





THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CV.

---

SATURDAY, JULY 15th, 1820.

---

THE concluding Number of my last volume, traced the progress of papal usurpation, from the time of Constantine the Great till the year 756, when the Pope became a temporal prince. The means by which he obtained his greatness, and the instruments that helped him to it, were such as the god of this world usually employs, for carrying on his work of deceit and violence, in order to effect the ruin of both the bodies and souls of men. This fact alone should convince every Christian, that popery is not of God, but of the devil; that it is not Christianity, but the opposite of it, and its irreconcilable enemy. As there is no evidence, either in Scripture or credible tradition, that the Pope of Rome was divinely appointed head of the church, it might have been expected, that such modern papists, as possess a portion of common sense, would have been very tender of the subject, and cautious how they brought it forward for public discussion. But as it is the main pillar of their system, they must give it a prominent place in all their books of controversy, even at the risk of being considered destitute of common sense.

In Bishop Hay's "Sincere Christian Instructed from the Written Word," we have the following catechetical exercise.

"Q. Who are the successors of St. Peter as head of the church?"

A. The bishops of the city of Rome, of which St. Peter was the first bishop, and suffered martyrdom in that city for the faith of Christ, leaving his successors there the heirs of all his power and authority." To this statement I have only one objection;—

namely, it is not true. It is one of those palpable lies by which Satan deceives those who love darkness rather than the light; and I again defy the Church of Rome to produce a particle of evidence, that Peter transmitted his power and authority to any man whatever. "Q. Wherein," continues the catechist, "consists the power of the bishop of Rome, as head of the church?"

A. As he is appointed by Jesus Christ, to be the supreme head and pastor of the church under him, to be the spiritual father and

teacher of all Christians, with full power to feed and govern the whole flock ; therefore he is the supreme judge and lawgiver, in all things relating to religion, whether as to faith, manners, or discipline. The primacy, both of honour and jurisdiction, over all other bishops, belongs to him : and all the members of the church are ' obliged to pay the greatest respect, veneration, and obedience, to his decrees and orders, in all things belonging to religion. Q. How is the head of the church commonly called ? A. He is called *the Pope*, which word signifies father, and is given to the head of the church : because, being the vicar of Jesus Christ, he is the common spiritual father of all Christians." One of the first things we should expect to find in a spiritual father is, that he be a spiritual man ; but it is notorious to all the world, that the greater part of the Popes were merely carnal men, and more taken up with the cares of this world, than with things spiritual and eternal. And if we could suppose a Pope to be a spiritual man, in the Bible sense of the words, he would have more modesty and more humility, than to pretend to be the " common spiritual father of all Christians ;" which title, as he would know, belongs to God alone.

I long ago maintained, that the head of the catholic or universal church, must be infallible, otherwise there would be no security against defection ; but bishop Hay seems not to be quite certain whether the Pope be infallible or not, though he seems rather inclined to believe that he is. He puts a question, and gives an answer thus :—" Q. When the head of the church emits any decree concerning faith or morals, to which he requires submission from all the faithful, is he himself infallible in what he there teaches? A. This is not proposed as an article of divine faith, nor has the church made any decision concerning it. Great numbers of the most learned divines are of opinion, that in such a case the head of the church is infallible in what he teaches ; but there are others of a contrary opinion, who think that his decree is not to be considered as infallibly certain, till the body of the bishops receive it, either by their express approbation, or by their tacit submission to it, by which it becomes a decree of the whole church, whose infallibility is undoubted." Chap. xii.

By the admission of the reverend prelate at the beginning of the above answer, he furnishes materials for overthrowing his own doctrine. If the infallibility of the Pope be not a matter of divine faith, and if the great and learned divines of the church be not agreed about it, what has become of the boasted unity of the Church of Rome, in all matters of faith ? and how does it appear, that the Pope was appointed head of the church, for the very purpose of maintaining unity of doctrine, when the mem-

bers of the body are not agreed about a most fundamental doctrine, namely, the seat of that infallibility which is held undoubtedly to be in the church? I shall suppose that the Pope gives out, or, to use the bishop's own language, "*emits* a decree concerning faith, and that the subject of it is his own infallibility, which he commands to be believed by all the faithful; great numbers of the most learned divines would require no more than his own word for it; because they are of opinion, that the head of the church is infallible in what he teaches: but there are others of a contrary opinion. Then there is a schism in the church; and that too, in relation to a point of vital importance; for if the opinion of the first class of divines be the true one, then, whatever the Pope decrees, ought to be instantly and implicitly accepted and obeyed; and those who refuse, are guilty of rebellion against the authority of the holy see, which, in a Papist's esteem, is the same thing as rebellion against God.

On the other hand, if the true and catholic doctrine be, that a decree of the Pope "is not to be considered as infallibly certain, till the body of bishops receive it, either by their express approbation, or by their tacit submission to it," then, those who receive such decrees on the authority of the Pope alone, and obey them, are guilty of contemning the whole "body of bishops," and setting at nought their authority, though it be admitted that they are the same as the whole church. This must be a very grievous error; for it is maintained, that their sentence, being that of the whole church, is undoubtedly infallible. The infallibility of the Pope alone is not so undoubted, for there are some who deny it; therefore, those who believe in it, and act upon it, must be in a most dangerous condition; I might even call it damnable, if I were to adopt the language of the *holy* Council of Trent.

Again, if no decree of the Pope is to be considered infallible, or to be received with a divine faith, till the "body of bishops," meaning, I suppose, all the bishops in the world, receive it by their express approbation, or tacit submission, then it may be a hundred years, and more, after a decree is *emitted* by his Holiness, ere it can be lawfully received by his spiritual children; for they may not, during all that time, have received sufficient evidence, that the "body of bishops," in all parts of the world, have approved of such decree. It is some hundreds of years since the Pope pretended to be infallible, as he ought most certainly to be, if he be Christ's vicar, and head of the church; but it seems, at this very day, the "body of bishops" are not agreed about it; and what confidence then can the people, in general have in it? The truth is, Papists are trusting in a broken reed.



that will do more than disappoint them in the day of trial. It will pierce and wound every hand that leans upon it.

Bishop Hay, as I have said, seems inclined to adopt the opinion of those, who think that "the Pope himself, when he speaks to all the faithful, as head of the church, is infallible in what he teaches;" and he says, that for this opinion there are "several very strong reasons, both from Scripture, tradition, and reason." He introduces his proof from Scripture as follows: "Because this privilege of the particular direction and assistance of God, in teaching true doctrine, was given to the high priest of the old law, and the synagogue being only a figure of the law of grace, and of the Church of Christ. the same privilege must certainly be given to the high priest or the church also, otherwise the figure would have been more perfect than the thing figured, the shadow more privileged than the substance." I do most readily grant, that the same, and greater privilege, is granted to the high priest of the church under the law of grace, as the Bishop calls it, though I believe what he calls the old law, was as really a law of grace as the new. But the question will occur, who is the high priest, of whom the high priest of the old law was a figure? the Bishop will have it to be the Pope of Rome; and because the high priest of the Jews was infallible in what he announced as the mind of God, (which, however, may reasonably be doubted,) therefore the Pope of Rome is infallible in all his decrees. This is Popish Episcopal logic of the highest order; and if all men are not thereby persuaded to fall down and worship the Pope as the great high priest of the Christian profession, the guilt of disobedience must rest upon their own heads.

Now it appears evidently from the New Testament, that the high priest of our profession, of whom Aaron and his sons were a figure, is no other than the Lord Jesus Christ himself; (Heb. iii. 1, 2.) and that he is infallible there can be no doubt among Christians; but to ascribe this office, and this infallibility, to the Pope of Rome, is such an instance of impiety and presumption, as we shall search for in vain, except in the writings of such men as Bishop Hay, who are determined, at all hazards, to support the usurpation of him who sitteth in the temple of God, and who exalteth himself above all that is called God, and that is worshipped.

The other scripture proofs relate to Peter, as the rock on which the church is built; and Christ's words to Peter, "I have prayed for thee," &c. which I have already considered. The proofs from tradition, are the mere ravings of ghostly fathers, whose authority is not the weight of a straw, in relation to a matter that ought to rest upon divine authority, if it is to command the faith of Christians. The proofs from reason are partly as fol-

ow, for I have not room for them all ; but such as I give will afford as fair a specimen of Popish lying and impudence as any man could wish to see.

“ The proofs from reason,” says Bishop Hay, “ are founded on facts, and on principles received by all members of the church as divine truths ; for, (1.) There never was an instance of any Pope who proposed any doctrine to be believed by the church, that was contrary to the sacred truths of faith revealed by Christ ; for, though there have been a *few*, and *only a few* Popes, that were bad men in their own practice, yet the most inveterate adversaries of the Catholic faith could never yet show that any Pope taught bad doctrine. (2.) Never yet did any Pope *emit* any decree concerning the truths of faith or sound morality, but was received by the great body of the bishops, as containing the most solid and wholesome doctrine. (3.) Many different heresies that have arisen in different ages in the church, have been proscribed and condemned by the authority of the head of the church alone, both before the first general council was held, and since. (4.) In all controversies of moment that have arisen in the church about points of faith, the bishops have always had recourse to the head of the church, as the supreme tribunal for settling them ; and, if the obstinacy of the party condemned by him made it advisable to have recourse to general councils, these councils never were found to do any thing else, after the most mature examination, but to confirm the sentence already passed by the head.” *Sincere Christian, &c. chap. xii.*

I question if there was ever so much downright falsehood contained in so small a space, as in the first of these four particulars which Bishop Hay gives as *facts*. It is false, that no Pope ever yet taught bad doctrine ; for, not to speak of others, the creed of Pope Pius IV. as we shall see by and by, is error and nonsense throughout. It is false, that only a few Popes were men of bad lives, for very many of them were monsters of wickedness. This must have been very well known by Bishop Hay, unless, indeed, his moral perceptions and feelings, like those of other Papists, were so depraved, that the grossest wickedness practised by great ecclesiastics, did not make them, in his esteem, “ bad men in their own practice.” He must have known, that very many of the Popes were habitually guilty of such crimes as would have entitled them to the appellation of bad men among the virtuous part of the community. He cannot, therefore, be acquitted of the crime of writing a falsehood, knowing it to be such. I request the reader not to take this sweeping accusation against the holy fathers of Rome upon my bare word, for I admit, that standing alone, it is of no more authority than that of the Bishop. But let him read attentively the most respectable ecclesiastical histo-

ries, even those written by Papists, and he will find that the assertions of Bishop Hay are directly opposed to truth. That "the body of the bishops" received the decrees of the Pope, and that they appealed to him as head of the church, are matters of no importance, for after they had become dependent upon him, as they all were, when their election was declared invalid without his confirmation, they would readily lick up any thing that he was pleased to "emit."

But suppose I were to admit the fact, that the Popes never taught bad doctrine, and, that very few of them led wicked lives, this would not prove the Pope to be infallible; because the same thing may be affirmed of hundreds and thousands who never made so high a claim. Yes, in the churches of England and Scotland, and among dissenters of different names, there are many pastors who cannot justly be accused of teaching error, or leading wicked lives; but it would require a logician like Bishop Hay, to prove them all infallible.

In opposition to Bishop Hay's assertion, that "the most inveterate adversaries of the Catholic faith could never yet shew that any Pope ever taught bad doctrine," it might be enough to assert, that every enemy of Popery, that ever lifted a tongue or a pen, has most abundantly shown this very thing. Every Pope has taught bad doctrine, and nothing else, ever since he began to teach that he was head of the church, and the vicar of Christ. Pope Pius IV. whom I have already mentioned, was at the pains to draw up, or order to be drawn up, a digest of the errors of the Church of Rome, which had accumulated by his time; he proposed them to be believed by all the faithful as infallible truths; and they are at this day received and held by all sound Papists, as of equal authority with the word of God. As I think this document ought to be generally known, in order to show what bad doctrine the Pope teaches, I shall give it here entire.

"I most firmly receive and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and the rest of the observances and constitutions of the church.

"I do also receive the holy Scriptures in the same sense that holy mother church does, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them; neither will I receive nor interpret them otherwise, than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

"I do likewise profess, that there are seven sacraments of the new law, truly and properly so called, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; and that they are necessary to the salvation of mankind, though not all of them to every one, *viz.* Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Matrimony; and that they confer grace; and that of these, Bap-



tism, Confirmation, and Orders, may not be repeated without sacrifice. I do also receive and admit the received and approved rites of the Catholic church, in the solemn administration of the above-said sacraments.

“ I do embrace and receive all and every thing that hath been defined and declared by the holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

“ I do in like manner profess, that in mass is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead, and that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is a change made of the whole substance of bread into the body, and of the whole substance of wine into the blood, which change the Catholic church calls transubstantiation.

“ I believe also, that under one kind only, a whole and entire Christ, and a true sacrament, is taken.

“ I do firmly maintain that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained, are relieved by the prayers of the faithful.

“ I do likewise believe, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be worshipped and prayed unto, and that they do offer up prayers for us, and that their relics are to be worshipped.

“ I do most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, and of the Mother of God, always a virgin, and of the other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration is to be given to them.

“ I also affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is very beneficial to Christian people.

“ I do acknowledge the holy, catholic, apostolic, Roman church, to be the mother and mistress of all churches, and do promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome and successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

“ I do also, without any doubt, receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined, and declared, by the sacred canons and general councils, and especially by the holy Council of Trent: and all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematised by the church, I do likewise condemn, reject and anathematise.”

To make the matter as sure as possible, an oath is subjoined to the above creed, to be taken by all the clergy. Having made profession of their faith, they add, “ This is the true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved, and which at this time I freely confess and truly embrace; and I will take care, by the help of God, that the same be retained and firmly professed, whole and inviolate, as long as I live, and as much as in me lies; that it be held, taught, and preached, by all those that are under my power

and by such as I shall have charge over in my profession, thus I, N. N. do promise, vow, and swear; so help me God, and these his holy gospels."

Such is the famous creed of Pope Pius IV. which is understood to express the whole faith of a Papist, in addition to the twelve articles in what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed. It is made the basis of several catechisms, which are in my possession. The above is a translation of it, as given by Mr Bennett in his *Memorial of the Reformation*, 2d. edit. chap. i. I have given it at length, not for the purpose of making an exposure of its errors at present, as I have exposed most of them already; but for the purpose of exposing the impudence of such writers as Bishop Hay, who assert that no enemy of Popery could ever yet show that any Pope ever taught bad doctrine. It may safely be left in the hands of any child who can read the Bible with understanding; and I have no doubt that any such child would soon perceive its doctrine to be bad in the extreme.

On this creed, and the solemn oath with which it is swallowed, I only remark farther at present, that it binds every Romish priest to believe both parts of a contradiction, and to abstain from every attempt to understand the Word of God. He swears to believe all that has been delivered by general councils, especially the Council of Trent; and that he will never receive or interpret the Holy Scriptures otherwise than according to the *unanimous consent* of the fathers. Such unanimous consent never existed, and when a priest swears that he will never receive the Scriptures *otherwise*, it is the same as to swear that he will never receive them at all; and from the manner in which some of the priests speak and write of the Bible, we may charitably believe that they are true to their oath. Besides, it is well known that there are many contradictions in the decrees, canons, and definitions of general councils. How then can a man swear to receive and obey them all, without an absolute surrender of his reason and his conscience? I know that Papists think very lightly of surrendering their reason, for it is what they do openly and avowedly every day, when they worship a piece of bread as the God that made them. But they do not yet so explicitly surrender their conscience; though it is virtually done by their avowal of implicit belief that a thing is and is not at the same time; or, for instance, that the Pope is above a council, and that a council is above the Pope, are both true.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CVI.

---

SATURDAY, JULY 22d, 1820.

---

THE infallibility of the Pope does not imply foreknowledge, which is one reason why the holy father commits so many blunders, both in his teaching and administration. It is in the recollection of many of my readers, that, about twenty years ago, the Pope blessed Buonaparte as his dear son in the faith, and even consented to set the imperial crown on his head. The holy father seemed even to glory in this dear son, as if he had been another Elijah, who had restored the true religion, after it had been subverted by the Jezebel goddess of reason. But the father did not foresee the future perversity of this son; and that the dignity and power, to which he had contributed to raise him, would be employed against himself. Such, however, turned out to be the case. Buonaparte was as great an oppressor of the holy see, as the king of the Lombards had been. It does not, however, appear, that the present Pope had so much interest in heaven as his predecessor Stephen had; or, that the Virgin Mary and St. Peter interposed on his behalf, either by word or writing. Indeed, so far as appears, he might have been calling upon these for help till this day, and with as much earnestness as the priests of Baal called upon their god, and he would have called in vain, had it not been for the persevering and successful exertions of a government and people, whom he curses and excommunicates every year on Holy Thursday.

The Pope could not bring any thunder from heaven, to bear upon his relentless oppressor, but he made the best use he could of that which he professed to have on the earth, as the reader will see from the following authentic document. I shall give it entire, for the sake of preserving it for the use of future historians, and writers on the Popish controversy. It is a great deal too long; and it will occupy the remainder of this, and half of the next Number. Like the writings of almost all Papists, from the head of their church downwards, it is remarkable for its pro-



fuse *wordiness*, which arises, I suppose, from the want of distinct conception; for when a writer has an idea distinctly in his own head, he will easily be able to convey it to others in few words. It would be impossible to do justice to this document, in the way of abridging it; and, therefore, I hope, the reader will bear with it, though it should try his patience, for the sake of the historical, and other curious matter which it contains.

*The Excommunication of the French Emperor and his adherents, by the Pope.*

The following curious Paper is translated from the Latin Original, which was sent over by Mr. Hill, the British Minister, in Sardinia. A translation in French has been circulated by the British Government, for the information of the Catholic world.—We copy the present translation, which we believe to be correct, from the Literary Panorama for March.

*Apostolic Letters, in Form of Brief,*

‘Whereby are declared excommunicated, and *de novo* are excommunicated, the authors, the active agents, and the partisans of the usurpation on the state of Rome, and on the other states appertaining to the holy see.

PIUS PP. VII.—*Ad Perpetuam rei Memoriam :*

‘WHEN, on the memorable 2d of February, 1808, the French troops, after having invaded the other and the richest provinces of the Pontifical state, with a sudden and hostile *impetus* entered Rome itself, it was impossible that we could bring our mind to attribute that outrage simply to political or to military reasons, reported among the people by the invaders; that is to say, to defend themselves in this city, and to exclude their enemies from the territories of the holy Roman church; neither did we see in it merely the desire of the chief of the French nation to take vengeance on our firmness and constancy, in refusing to acquiesce in his requests. We saw instantly, that this proceeding had a much more extensive view than a temporary occupation, a military precaution, or a simple demonstration of anger against ourselves. We saw revive, and again glow, and again burst out on all sides, those fraudulent and impious plots, which appeared to be, if not subdued, at least repressed; which originated among those men deceived and deceiving ‘by philosophy and vain deceit, introducing damnable heresies,’ and who had long planned, and formed parties to accomplish, the destruction of our holy religion. We saw that, in our humble personage, they insulted, they circumvented, they attacked the holy see of the most blessed prince of the apostles, in order that they might

by any means overthrow it, from its very foundation ; and with it the Catholic church, although established on the most solid rock, by its divine Founder, in this holy see.

‘ We had thought, we had also hoped, that the French government, taught by experience the evils in which that most powerful nation had involved itself by unreined impiety and schism, and convinced by the unanimous declarations of by far the greater part of its citizens, was truly and heartily persuaded, that its own security, as well as the public happiness, was deeply interested in the free and sincere restoration of the exercise of the Catholic religion, and in its defence against all assailants. Moved by this opinion, and excited by this hope, we, unworthy as we are, who upon earth represent the God of Peace, scarcely perceived any prospect of repairing the disasters of the Gallican church, when—the whole world is our witness ! with what alacrity we listened to proposals of peace, and how much it cost us, and the church itself, to conduct those treaties to such a conclusion as it was possible to obtain : but, immortal God ! in what did our hopes terminate ! What has been the fruit of our so great indulgence and liberality ! From the very promulgation of that agreement, we have been constrained to complain, with the prophet, ‘ Behold, in peace my bitterness becomes most bitter.’ This bitterness we have not concealed from the church, nor from our brethren the cardinals of the holy Roman church, in our allocution to them in consistory, May 24, 1802. We then informed them, that, to the convention we had made, were added several articles *unknown to us, and disapproved by us the instant we knew them*. In reality, by these articles, not only was the free exercise of the Catholic religion withheld, in points of the greatest consequence and interest to the liberty which had been verbally assured, stipulated, and solemnly promised, as introductory to the convention, and as its basis ; but also, in several of these articles, the doctrine of the gospel was closely attacked.

‘ Nearly the same was the result of the convention concluded by us with the government of the Italian Republic. Those very articles were interpreted in a manner altogether arbitrary, with highly perverse and peculiar fraud, as well as injury ; against which arbitrary and perverse interpretation we had guarded with the utmost solicitude.

‘ Both these conventions being violated in this manner, and disfigured in whatever had been stipulated in favour of the church, —the spiritual power also being subjected to the will of the *laic* ; so far were the salutary effects that we had proposed to ourselves following these conventions, that other, and still greater evils and injuries to the church of Jesus Christ, we saw growing and spreading daily

‘ We shall not here enumerate particularly those evils, because they are sufficiently known in the world, and deplored with tears by all good men : they are besides sufficiently declared in the two consistorial allocutions, which we made March 16, and July 11, 1808 ; which we caused to be made public, as much as our state of restraint admitted. From those all may know, and all posterity will see, what at that time were our sentiments on so many and great injuries suffered from the government of France, in things appertaining to the church : they will know with what long suffering and patience we were so long silent,—with what constancy we maintained the love of peace ; and how firmly we retained the hope, that a remedy adequate to such great evils might be found, and that an end might be put to them ; for which cause we have deferred from day to day the lifting up of our apostolic voice. They will see what were our labours and anxieties,—what our endeavours, deprecations, protestations, sighings (incessant have they been !) that the wounds of the church might be healed,—while we have intreated that new sufferings might not be inflicted upon her : but, in vain have been exhausted all the powers of humility, of moderation, of mildness, by which hitherto we have studied to shield the rights and interests of the church from him, who had associated himself with the devices of the impious to destroy it utterly ; who, with that spirit had affected friendship for her, that he might more readily betray her,—who had feigned to protect her, that he might more securely oppress her.

‘ Much and often, even daily, have we been bid to hope, especially when our journey into France was wished for and solicited ; but from that period our expostulations have been eluded by bold tergiversations and cavillings ; and by answers given purposely to prolong the matter, or to mislead by fallacy. At length they could obtain no attention. As the time appointed for maturing the councils already taken against this holy see, and the Church of Christ, approached, we were assailed, we were harrassed perpetually, and perpetually were demands, either exorbitant or captious, made ; the nature of which showed clearly enough, and more than enough, that two objects, equally destructive and ruinous to this holy see and church, were kept in view ; that is to say, either that by assenting to them we should be guilty of betraying our office, or that if we refused, occasion might from thence be taken of declaring against us an open war.

‘ As we could in nowise comply with those demands made upon us, they being contrary to conscience, from thence a pretext was formed to send, in a hostile manner, military forces into this holy city : they seized Fort Saint Angelo ; they occupied stations in the streets, in the squares ; the palace itself, in which we



resided, the Quirinal palace, was threatened with all the horrors of war and siege, by a great body of infantry and cavalry : but we, being strengthened by God, through whom we can do all things, and sustained by a conscientious sense of our duty, were nothing alarmed, nor dejected in our mind by this sudden terror, and this display of the apparatus of war. With a peaceful, an equable mind, as we ought, we performed the sacred ceremonies, and the divine mysteries appropriated to that most holy day, with all becoming solemnity ; and neither through fear, nor through forgetfulness, nor by negligence, were any of them omitted, which were appointed as our duty in such a situation of things.

‘ We recollected, with Saint Ambrose, (de Basilic. tradend No. 17.) that the holy man Naboth, the possessor of his vineyard, when called by demand of the king to surrender his vineyard, in which the king, after having rooted up the vines, might plant a vile garden of herbs, he answered him, ‘ The Lord forbid that I should give the inheritance of my fathers to thee !’ Much less could we suppose it was lawful for us to deliver up so ancient and sacred a heritage (*i. e.* the temporal sovereignty of this holy see, not without the evident appointment of Divine Providence, possessed by the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, for so long a series of ages,) or even by silence to seem to consent, that any should obtain this city, the metropolis of the Catholic world, where, after disturbing and destroying the most holy form of discipline, which was left by Jesus Christ to his holy church, and ordained by the sacred canons under the guidance of the Spirit of God, he should in its stead substitute a code, not only contrary to the holy canons, but in opposition and even repugnant to the precepts of the gospels, according to his custom, and to the new order of things of the present day, which manifestly tends to confound by consociation all superstitions, and every sect with the Catholic church.

‘ Naboth defended his vineyard, even with his own blood, (St. Amb. *ibid.*) Could we, therefore, (whatever in the issue might befall us) decline from defending the rights and possessions of the holy Roman church, which, to promote as far as in us lay, we had bound ourselves by the most solemn of religious obligations ? or, Could we refrain from vindicating the liberty of the apostolic see, which is so intimately combined with the liberty and utility of the universal church ?

‘ How extremely fit, and even necessary these temporal principalities are to secure to the supreme head of the church the safe and free exercise of his spiritual functions, which, by the divine will, are committed to him over all the world, may be from the present occurrences (were other arguments wanting) already too clearly demonstrated. On this account, although we affected not this temporal sovereignty, either for grandeur, or

for wealth, or for dominion,—an unwarrantable desire, equally distant from our natural disposition and our most holy character, which from our earliest years, we have always regarded,—yet we have strongly felt that it was due to the indispensable duty of our office, from the very day of the 2d of February, 1808, to the utmost of our power amidst such constraints, to issue by our cardinal, secretary of state, a solemn protestation, by which to render public the cause of the tribulation under which we suffered, and to declare our resolution to maintain whole and entire the rights of the apostolic see.

‘ When, in the mean while, the invaders obtained no advantage by threats, they determined to act towards us on another system. By a certain slow, but most vexatious and even most cruel kind of persecution, they attacked, with intention to weaken, by little and little, our constancy, which they had not been able to shake by sudden terror. Therefore, while they held us in custody in our palace, there passed scarcely a single day from the said second day of February, which was not marked by some new injury to this holy see, or by some new vexation to our very soul. All the troops which had been employed by us to preserve civil order and discipline, were taken from us, and mixed with the French bands. Our very body guards, men the most select and most noble, were imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo ; there they were detained many days, then they were dispersed, and their companies dissolved. At the gates, and in other places of this most celebrated city, *corps de garde* were posted. The post-office, and all printing-offices, especially that of our Apostolic Chamber, and that of the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*, were subjected to military force and orders ; by which we were deprived of the liberty of printing, or of directing others to print what we desired. The regulations for administering public justice were disturbed and hindered. Solicited by fraud, by deceit, by every kind of evil artifice, to swell the mass of what they called national guards, our subjects became rebels against their lawful prince. The most audacious and most abandoned of them accepting the tri-coloured French and Italian cockade, and protected by that as by a shield, with impunity spread themselves every where,—now in bodies, now single ; and, either by command or by permission, broke out into every enormity against the ministers of the church, against the government, against good men. Journals, or, as they call them, *Feuilles Periodiques*, in defiance of our complaints, were printed at Rome, and circulated among the populace and in foreign parts, filled with injuries, sarcasms, and calumnies, decrying either the pontifical power or dignity. Sundry of our declarations, which were of great moment, and signed with our own hand, or by that of our first minister, and by our order af.

fixed in the customary places,—these by the hands of the vilest satellites (amid the greatest indignation and lamentation of all good men) were torn down, torn in pieces, and trod under foot. Ill-advised youth, and other citizens, were invited, elected, and inscribed in suspicious conventicles, although such were most strictly prohibited, under the penalty even of anathema, by laws, both civil and ecclesiastic, enacted by our predecessors, Clement VII. and Benedict XIV. Many of our administrators and official agents, as well of the city as of the provinces, men of the greatest integrity, and fidelity, were insulted, were thrown into prison, were exiled to great distances. Searches after papers and writings of every kind, in the private repositories of the magistrates of the pontificate, not even excepting those of the first minister of our cabinet, were made with violence. Three of our first ministers, secretaries of state, whom we had been obliged to employ one after the other, were carried off from our own residence; and at last, the majority of the most holy cardinals of the sacred Roman church, our fellows and fellow-labourers, were torn from our side, and transported afar off by military force.

‘ These facts, and others not less contrary to every right, human and divine, wickedly attempted and hardily perpetrated, are so well known by the public, that there is no necessity to recount them numerically, or to expatiate on them at large. Neither have we omitted, (that we might not so much as seem to connive at them, or in any manner to assent to them) to expostulate sharply and strongly according to the duty of our place.

‘ Despoiled in such a manner, as it were, of all the ornaments of dignity and supports of authority,—deprived of all the accessories to the fulfilment of our office, and especially of those in which all the churches were interested,—suffering injuries of every description,—vexed by all kinds of terrors and excruciations,—oppressed so extremely, that even the exercise of both our powers was daily further impeded,—after the singular and evident providence of God, the best and greatest which has supported our fortitude, we are beholden to the prudence of such of our ministers as remained, to the fidelity of our subjects, and to the piety of the faithful, that any semblance of those powers is yet remaining.

‘ But, if our temporal power were reduced to a vain and empty appearance, in this city and in the adjoining provinces, it was in the most flourishing province of Urbino, of March, and of Camerini, at the same time absolutely taken away. Wherefore, we did not fail to issue a solemn protest against this manifest and sacrilegious usurpation of so many states of the church; as also to admonish our beloved against the seductions of an unjust and illegitimate government; nor did we omit to address an instruction to our venerable brethren, the bishops of those provinces.



‘That government, however, was not slow! How speedily did it prove by facts, and furnish decisive evidence, that in that instruction we had foretold what religion had to expect from it! The occupation, the plunder of the patrimony of Jesus Christ, the abolition of religious houses, the expulsion of the holy virgins from their cloisters, the profanation of churches, the allowance of unbridled licentiousness, the contempt of ecclesiastical discipline and of the holy canons; the promulgation of a code, and of other laws, contrary not only to those holy canons, but also to the precepts of the gospels and to the divine rights; the abasement and oppression of the clergy; the subjection of the sacred power of the bishops to the power of laymen; the force in many ways put upon their consciences; the violent displacing of them from their cathedrals, and sending them away, with other equally nefarious, equally sacrilegious atrocities against the liberty, the immunity, and the doctrine of the church in those our provinces, committed instantly, as before in all those other places which had fallen under the power of that government,—these, these, are the wonderful rewards!—these the illustrious monuments of that astonishing attachment to the Catholic religion, which, even at this day, is incessantly boasted of and promised!

‘For us, who experience so many bitternesses on the part of those from whom we could least expect them, already filled with them, and afflicted by them on every side, we grieve not so much for the present as for the future state of our persecutors:—‘for if the living Lord be angry with us a little [*while*, Eng. *r.*] for our chastening and correction, yet shall he be at one again with his servants: but thou, who hast been the author of all mischiefs against the church [the Hebrews] how shalt thou escape the hand of God? God will not forgive any, neither will he respect the greatness of any: for he made both the small and great; and to the most powerful he has reserved the most powerful punishment’ \*. Moreover, we desire, that by whatever means, even by our own life, the eternal perdition of our persecutors might be prevented, and their salvation ensured!—for still we love them; and never have we ceased to love them! We desire never to depart from that spirit of charity, that spirit of meekness † which nature has imparted to us, which our will has exercised, and that we might in future, as we have hitherto, *spare the rod*, which has been given to us, together with the charge of the whole flock of the Lord, in the person of the most blessed Peter, from the prince of pastors, for the correction and the punishment of wanderers, and of obdurate sheep, and for making them an example and a salutary terror to others.

\* 2 Macc. vii. 33, 34.

† 1 Cor. iv. 21.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CVII.

---

SATURDAY, JULY 29th, 1820.

---

*Excommunication of Buonaparte, &c. continued from preceding Number.*

BUT this is not the moment for lenity. Every one who beholds cannot but see, unless he be wilfully blind, to what such atrocities tend, if they be not opposed in some manner, while it may be done. On the other hand, there is none who does not see, that there remains no hope, in any shape, that their authors, either by admonitions, or by councils, or by intreaties, or by expostulations, may be rendered friendly to the church. To those means they have left no access: they neither hear them, nor answer them, but by accumulating injuries upon injuries;—nor can it be pretended that they submit to the church as sons to a mother, or as disciples to their mistress,—by those who devise nothing, who do nothing, who attempt nothing, but with intention to subject her as a servant to her master, and by subjecting her to overturn her very foundations.

‘What then remains for us to do, unless we would incur the reproach of negligence or slothfulness, or perhaps even that of having wickedly deserted the cause of God!—except to lay aside all reference to terrestrial things, to renounce all fleshly prudence, and to follow the precept of the gospel, ‘If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen man, and a publican.’\* Let them once again understand that, ‘by the law of Christ, their sovereignty is subjected to our throne: for we also exercise a sovereignty; we add also, a more noble sovereignty, unless it were just that the spirit should yield to the flesh, and celestial things to terrestrial.† Many great Pontiffs, illustrious by their doctrine and holiness, by one or other of those crimes which are subjected to anathema by the sacred canons, have been reduced to equal extremities in behalf of the church, against kings and contumacious princes. Shall we fear to follow their example even in this, after so many crimes, so nefarious, so atrocious, so sacrilegious,

\* Matt. xvii.

† St. Greg. Naz. Orat. xviii. ad Maur.

so universally known, so openly manifest to all ? Should not our fear be greater, rather to have justly deserved the accusation of having so done too late, rather than too early ; especially, when by this last crime, the most wicked of all that have hitherto been perpetrated against our temporal sovereignty, we are warned, that from henceforth we shall not be more free to discharge those so weighty and necessary duties of our Apostolic Ministry ?

‘ Wherefore, by the authority of Almighty God, and of the most holy apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own, we declare all those who after the invasion of this holy city, and the ecclesiastical dominions, and the sacrilegious violation of the patrimony of the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, by the Gallic troops (outrages complained of by us in the aforesaid two consistorial allocutions, and in many protests and reclamations published by our order in the said city, and states of the church,) against the immunity of the church, against the church itself, and the rights of this holy see, and its temporal authority, perpetrated either by themselves or by others, together with all their abettors, advisers, adherents, or others in any manner concerned in the furthering of the aforesaid violences we decree that they have incurred the GREATER EXCOMMUNICATION, with the other censures, and penalties inflicted by the sacred canons, by the apostolic constitutions, and by the general councils ; especially by that of the Council of Trent, (Sess. xxii. cap. xi. de Reform.) ; and if need be, we do anew excommunicate and anathematize them ; we declare that they have incurred, as penalties, the loss of all and every kind of privilege, grace and indulgence, in whatsoever manner granted to them, whether by us, or by the Roman Pontiffs our predecessors ; neither from this censure can they be liberated or absolved by any, unless by us, or by the Roman Pontiff for the time being, unless in the article of death ; and then falling again under the same censures in case of recovery ; and further they are incompetent and incapable to obtain the benefit attending on absolution, until they have publicly retracted, revoked, annulled, and abolished, to the utmost possible, all and every kind of outrage ; and have effectually reinstated all things, or otherwise have made condign satisfaction to the church, and to us, and to this holy see, in the premises aforesaid.

‘ Wherefore we decree and declare by these presents, that all those, and likewise all others, deserving of the most special mention, together with their successors in office, shall never, under any pretence, be in any degree relieved from the retraction, revocation, annulling, and abolition of all the outrages above-mentioned ; but shall be bound to make adequate, real, and effectual satisfaction to the church, to us, and to the said holy see, according to these presents ; yea, they are always bound under these obligations, and



shall so continue, in order to the validity of whatever benefits they may obtain from absolution.

‘ But, while we are constrained to draw from its scabbard the sword of church severity, we do not in the least forget, that, unworthy though we be, we hold the place of him who, when he exercises his justice, does not forget mercy. Therefore, we direct and command, first our own subjects, and also all Christian people, in virtue of holy obedience, that none of them on occasion of these letters, or by any pretext derived from them, should presume to hurt, injure, prejudice, or damage in any manner whatever, the said parties, their property, rights, or prerogatives. Even while inflicting those punishments which God has put in our power, for so many and so great injuries to God, and to his holy church, we propose to ourselves, above all, ‘ that those who now trouble us should be converted, and be troubled with us, (St. Aug. Ps. liv. 1.) if haply it might prove that ‘ God should give them repentance to the acknowledgement of the truth.’\*

‘ For these causes, lifting up our hands to heaven in the humility of our heart, we do again remit and commend to God, whose, rather than ours, is that most just cause which we support ; and again by his grace assisting us, we profess our readiness to drink to the very dregs, on the behalf of his church, that cup which he himself first of all condescended to drink for her. We beseech and intreat him by the bowels of his mercy, that he would not despise nor reject the prayers and deprecations addressed to him by us, day and night for their recovery. Certainly, no day so bright or equally joyful, could shine for us, as that on which it were granted us by the Divine mercy to see our sons, now the cause of so much tribulation and grief to us, again taking refuge in our paternal bosom, and speedily returning to the sheepfold.

‘ We decree that the present letters, and every thing in them contained, or deducible from them, may not at any time (even under the parties before-mentioned, or any others interested in the premises, in whatever manner, or of whatever state, degree, order, pre-eminence, or dignity they may be, or otherwise ; or who ought to be mentioned individually, or specially, by any other expression or term of dignity, by pleading that they have not consented, or that having been called, cited, and heard, that they have not been sufficiently convinced of the verity and justice of the occasion of these presents, or for any other cause, colour, or pretext whatever) we say, may not at any time be impeached or subreption or obreption, or nullity, or want of intention on our part, or want of consent of the parties interested, nor of any other defect whatever : neither shall they be held, impugned, infringed

refracted, questioned, or reduced to terms of right; neither shall any remedy lie against them by special pleading, or by restitution to the import of the whole, or by other evasion of right, of fact, or of grace; neither shall this remedy, having been solicited, granted, and issued of our knowledge and plenitude of power, be questioned in judgment, or out of judgment; but the present letters shall always continue firm, valid, and efficacious, and shall maintain and obtain their full and entire effect; and by those whom they concern, and for so long as they concern them, they shall be held inviolable and unshaken: so, and not otherwise, shall they be taken by all judges, ordinary, or delegate; also by the auditors of causes of the apostolic palace, and by the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, also by the legates *a latere*, and by the Nuncios of the said see, and by all others enjoying or to enjoy whatsoever pre-eminence, or power; depriving them and each of them, whoever he be, of the power, faculty, and authority of otherwise judging of them, and interpreting them: declaring null and void whatever may be attempted against them by any one, whether by authority, and of knowledge, or by ignorance.

‘ Notwithstanding the foregoing, and so far as need be, our rule, and that of the apostolic chancery, *de jure quæsito non tollendo*, and the other apostolic constitutions and appointments, and whatever other statutes and customs established by oath, or by apostolic confirmation, or by any other corroboration and establishment,—notwithstanding all usages and styles from time immemorial, all previous privileges, indulgences, and apostolic letters;—notwithstanding all other, or whatsoever persons, and with whatever dignity resplendent, whether ecclesiastical or worldly, and however qualified, and requiring specially to be expressed, under whatever tenor and form of words,—notwithstanding, also, whatever clause derogatory of derogatories, or other efficacious of most efficacious, or insolite, or irritating, and all other decrees, purporting to be of motion, of knowledge, and of full power, whether consistorial, or otherwise, in whatever manner, contrary to these premises granted, yielded, made, and often repeated, and however often they may have been seen, approved, confirmed, and renewed,—from all and singular of them in the present instance, we derogate;—from their whole tenor general and special, specific, express, and individual, word by word, and not only by general clauses, under whatever form expressed,—according to the tenor of these presents, as if they were here inserted and explained word for word, formally, and nothing of them omitted; taking them as if they were wholly and sufficiently expressed and inserted in these presents; which notwithstanding, shall still continue in their full strength and primary effect for this special purpose; and we do

expressly derogate from whatever is contrary to them ; and our will is that such be derogated from.

‘ And whereas these present letters cannot be safely published, especially in those places where there is the greatest need, as is a notorious fact, our will is that they, or copies of them, be affixed and published at the doors of the church of the Lateran, of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, also of the Apostolic Chancery, of the General Court of the *Monte Citorio*, and in the Square of the *Campo di Fiore* in this city ; and that, being so affixed and published, they should be binding on all and singular who are concerned in them, as if they had been served on each of them nominally and personally.

‘ And further our will is, that to the same letters, or otherwise printed copies of them, subscribed by the hand of some notary public, and furnished with the seal of some person of ecclesiastical dignity, faith be given, in every place, and among every people, as well in judgment as out of judgment, wherever they may be exhibited, as if these presents themselves were here exhibited and shown.

‘ Given at Rome, at the Church of Santa Maria the Major, under the Fisherman’s Ring, the 10th day of July, 1809, in the Tenth Year of our Pontificate.  
PIUS, PP. VII.’

---

“ This curious paper, which will be memorable in the annals of ecclesiastical history, needs no comment. We may, however, readily suppose, from the well-known disposition of the French Emperor, that this bold act of his Holiness would be warmly resented. We are informed, by the public papers, that the Pope had been escorted, under a strict guard, to Savona, where he had been kept in close confinement several days. He was then removed to Grenoble, with a design, as it was supposed, of being taken farther into France ; but the people flocked with such eagerness from all parts to pay homage to the unfortunate Pontiff, increasing in numbers in proportion to his progress, that the French general deemed it prudent to return with him to Savona, till further orders were received from Paris. No person is permitted to see him, but those to whose care he is entrusted.

“ It is also added, That before he left Rome, aware of the dreadful measures to which the French Ruler might have recourse, in order to extort from him what measures his policy might require, he had in conjunction with the body of cardinals, chosen his coadjutor and successor to the Pontificate, who is said to be the Archbishop of Palermo.” *Religious Monitor for Aug. 1810.*



I have inserted this document rather for preservation, than with a view to the exposure of its impieties. Yet there are some things in it that show the cloven foot as distinctly as if it had been the work of the Alexanders and the Innocents, of a period before the Reformation. With some remarks on these I shall occupy the remaining pages of this Number.

The holy father is pleased to proclaim, in one short sentence, both his littleness and his greatness—"We, *unworthy as we are*, who upon earth, *represent the God of peace*."—(see No. CVI. page 11.) It is difficult to imagine greater impiety and presumption, than for one who is *unworthy*, to give himself out as God's *representative*! God never had a representative in the world but one, and he was infinitely worthy. God was represented, or to speak more properly, manifested in the person of Jesus Christ, who in his life and doctrine, gave a true representation of the divine character. And Christ, as Mediator, has received from the Father sovereign authority over all persons and things in earth, and also in heaven. In the exercise of this authority, he may be called the representative of the Father. He received the kingdom from him, and will deliver it up to him again. (1 Cor. xv. 24.) But for a sinful creature to usurp the authority, and assume the title of representative of God on earth, is such shocking impiety, that we can scarcely suppose the idea to have originated with man, depraved as he is. It must have proceeded from the angel of the bottomless pit.

Nothing can more plainly point out the Man of Sin, spoken of by the apostle Paul, (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.) than this assumption of the style of representative of God. It implies, not merely a claim to be regarded as a God; but to be regarded, obeyed, and worshipped as the *substitute* of the only living and true God. Thus the inspired apostle expounds it. He "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God;" and the application of this to the Pope of Rome, is proved by the fact, that he is, on certain occasions, especially on his being raised to the Pontificate, the object of humble and prostrate adoration by the cardinals, inferior clergy, and all whom he is pleased to admit to the "august ceremony of the adoration."

I am not speaking of the Popes who reigned five hundred years ago, and who gave laws to the world during the dark ages. I am speaking of the Sovereign Pontiff, who reigns in Rome at this very day. He claims to be the representative of God on the earth; and as such he virtually gives himself out, as the God whom all men on earth ought to worship. The true God hath declared that he will not give his glory to another. There is



nothing of which he is so jealous as of the worship that is due to him. Let our modern Papists think of this; and let them consider how they will be able to answer at the last day, when the great idol who deceived the nations of the world, and all who were deceived by him, and who fell down to worship him, shall be called to give an account of their idolatries, and other abominations.

Intimately connected with this, is the claim which his Holiness asserts over all temporal and earthly thrones. He refers immediately to that of France, but, as his language is general, and in the plural, it is evidently meant to apply to all the kingdoms in the world. "Let them once again understand," says he, "that by the law of Christ, their sovereignty *is subjected to our throne*; for we also exercise a sovereignty; we add also, a more noble sovereignty, unless it were just that the spirit should yield to the flesh, and celestial things to terrestrial." We know one, and only one, who can say with truth, "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, yea all the judges of the earth." (Prov. viii. 15, 16.) We know no other "throne," or power to which the princes of this world are subject: but there is a silly priest in Rome, called the Pope, who modestly gives himself out as occupying the throne of the King eternal, immortal, and invisible; and who therefore claims to have authority over the princes of this world. I again request my readers to remember, that this is not the language of a monk of the dark ages. It is the language of the man, who, at this moment, presides over what is called the Catholic Church,—of the man, to whom every Popish priest in Britain and Ireland, has sworn implicit obedience and subjection. He does not at present mention the British throne by name, as subject to his throne; but it is implied in his general reference to all temporal thrones. He did formerly declare the British throne to be subject to his. He has never yet withdrawn the claim; and the army of priests who have sworn allegiance to him, are watching their opportunity of again asserting the sovereignty of their spiritual head, who was never yet known to relinquish a claim of power and authority which he or his predecessors had made.

Let us reflect then for a moment, what would be the consequence, if we had one or two hundred Papists in our houses of Parliament, and, perhaps, a dozen of them in the Privy Council. Every one of them would be the humble servant of his priest and confessor, and every priest is the sworn vassal of Pope Pius VII., who publicly declares, that he has a throne that is above all earthly thrones, and therefore, above that of Great Britain; whose predecessors excommunicated and deposed our sovereigns at their pleasure, and gave the kingdom to others; the right and author-

ity of doing which, has never, by the Popes, been relinquished but by the present Pope, re-asserted in the Deed which I have under consideration. Then surely, every Papist who should have power, would feel it to be his bounden duty to re-establish the glory of his church, and of the head of his church, in this kingdom, which he must, and really does consider, as having been unjustly and most wickedly separated from the dominion of the holy see of St. Peter.

It will be replied, that our English Papists declare upon oath, that the Pope of Rome hath no civil power or authority in Great Britain or Ireland ; but this declaration is of no value, seeing the Pope himself has not made it. Innocent III. excommunicated and deposed King John, and laid England under an interdict. Both Clement VII. and Paul III. excommunicated Henry VIII. Pius V. excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and commanded her subjects to rebel against her ; and there is scarcely a kingdom in Europe whose sovereign did not at one time or other suffer the same indignity. Now the Pope has never yet said, that the throne of Britain is not subject to his throne. He has never condemned the deeds of his predecessors, who excommunicated and deposed our sovereigns. He is just as ready to urge his claim of sovereignty over Britain as over France, when he shall see a favourable opportunity : and let his subjects swear what they will, there is a prior and more sacred oath, which at least every priest has sworn, which binds him above all earthly things, to obey, and promote the interest of the holy see. The binding obligation of this oath cannot be set aside by an oath of allegiance to any secular prince, or by any declaratory oath with regard to the authority which the Pope has or ought to have in this kingdom. It binds him to support every measure that shall promote the honour of the Pope, and the interest of Popery, if it should even be the setting up of a Popish Pretender to the crown. I do not say that this is likely to happen in our day ; but let Papists get into power, and it will not be their fault if it do not happen : nay, they are under the most solemn obligations to bring it about if they can ; and from a speech by Dr. Dromgoole, one of their Irish demagogues, we learn that they are not without the hope of seeing it at no very distant period. See PROT. vol. i. p. 215.

THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CVIII.

---

SATURDAY, AUGUST 5th, 1820.

---

IT was not because Buonaparte was a usurper and a wholesale and retail murderer, that the Pope denounced against him the dreadful sentence of Excommunication which occupies the greater part of my last two Numbers. He might have gone on plundering and massacring the nations of Europe one after another, and yet have enjoyed full communion with the holy see, in all the spiritual privileges which belong to it. It was his invasion of the holy see itself, and of the city of Rome, that was the heinous offence that brought upon his head the thunder of the Vatican. "Therefore," says the Pope, "by the authority of Almighty God, and of the most holy apostles Peter and Paul, and by *our own*, we declare all those who, after the invasion of this *holy city*, and the ecclesiastical dominions, and the sacrilegious violation of the patrimony of the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles," &c. &c. "We decree, that they have incurred the GREATER EXCOMMUNICATION, &c."

I need not inquire what Peter or Paul had to do with such paltry patrimony as a few thousand acres of Italian ground, after they had obtained the crown of life, and an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away: but it is worth while to point out the gross impiety of his *Holiness*, in interposing the authority of the Almighty in the manner he has done. He seems to have the same notions of the true God as the Syrians had; "He is the god of the hills but not the god of the valleys." He is the god of Italy and of the ecclesiastical dominions, but not the god of Holland, or of Prussia; else why not be called upon to interpose on behalf of these kingdoms, when they were invaded and plundered by the French troops? The Almighty is the God of the whole earth; and Buonaparte's depredations upon the Netherlands must have been as offensive to Him, as the invasion of the Ecclesiastical dominions; but the *unworthy* representative of God on the earth, as the Pope modestly stiles himself, took no interest



in the misery of other countries; he did not think of applying his spiritual power for the correction of the invader, until his ambition began to affect himself, and his dominions. Then, indeed, it was a different matter. He could "*spare the rod*" no longer. The rod, he says, was given to him "with the charge of the whole flock of the Lord, in the person of the most blessed Peter, from the prince of pastors, for the correction and the punishment of wanderers, and of obdurate sheep." But it appears that Buonaparte was not looked upon by his Holiness as a wanderer from the right path, or an obdurate sheep, notwithstanding his manifold crimes, till he invaded the dominions of the holy see. From that day, he was unworthy of the communion of the faithful; and he fell of course to be excommunicated.

As it is time to be drawing the subject of the Pope and his supremacy to a close, I shall endeavour to comprise what I have farther to say within the present Number. It would be easy to shew from the mode of electing men to be Popes, and from the conduct of the greater part of them after they were elected, that there is nothing heavenly or divine in the system; but that the whole is tainted by the most disgusting of this world's politics. I refer to the Life of Pope Sixtus V., written in Italian by Gregorio Leti, and translated into English by Ellis Farnsworth, as affording a full view of the mode of electing to the holy chair; and such a scene of caballing and deceit will not readily be witnessed in those who conduct the affairs of the worst secular government in the world. The moral character of Sixtus was superior to that of most of his predecessors; yet he acquired the Pontificate by means of a system of cunning and falsehood, practised for many years. By his talents and address he raised himself from being a swine herd, to the dignity of a cardinal; and then, by seeming to renounce all the cares of this world, by affecting the feebleness of an old man, with one foot in the grave, and the other lifted up to follow, he succeeded in procuring himself to be elected to the Pontificate. He had long foreseen, that when the chair should become vacant, it would be difficult to fill it, as the cardinals were divided into different parties almost equally balanced. He saw that none of the parties were sufficiently confident of their own strength, and that they would probably unite in the choice of some crazy old man, merely to keep the chair occupied for a few months, each party expecting to gather more strength before the old man should die. Such a crazy subject appeared the Cardinal Montalto, for that was the name he bore in the conclave.

"During the ten days that the funeral ceremonies of the deceased Pope lasted," says the Biographer of Sixtus V., "they that had any pretensions to the papacy were carrying on their schemes and intrigues, running about to solicit the suffrages and interest of their



friends; whilst Montalto did not seem to give himself the least trouble or concern. He took so uncommon a road to it, that nobody suspected he had any design at all of the kind. Some of the cardinals out of contempt called him the Ass of La Marca, (which he pretended not to hear, or take notice of,) looking upon his faculties and intellects as entirely gone; and others seeing him bent down with disease and old age, did not in the least dream of his ever being elected. But we must take notice, by the by, that he was the youngest of all those who aspired to the pontificate; and though he often used to say, that an old fellow of seventy, was fit for nothing in this world; it is certain, that at that time, he was only in his sixty-fourth year. Indeed, hardly any one could have imagined, that the cardinals would turn their eyes upon a person that could scarcely stand upon his legs, whom they thought little better than a dotard and a driveller; as the government of the holy see requires a man of sound and strong faculties, both of body and mind. Yet it was to these very failings that Montalto owed his exaltation." p. 172. When he was incidentally mentioned as having as good a chance as any other, he replied, "The cardinals would be very wrong-headed, indeed, to think of such a poor object as him, who had it not in his power to do any one thing but wish well to his patrons and friends." When the thing was more seriously proposed to him, he fell into such a violent fit of coughing, that his friends thought he would have died upon the spot, and he said, as soon as he could speak, "that his reign would be but of a few days; that, besides the continual difficulty with which he drew his breath, he had not strength enough to support such a weight; and that his small experience in affairs, made him altogether unfit for a charge of so important a nature, except he could depend upon the assistance of others." They answered, that God would give him strength sufficient to govern his church; to which he replied, "that he never would accept of it upon any terms whatsoever, except they would all three promise not to abandon him, but take the greatest part of the weight off his shoulders, as he was neither able, nor could in conscience pretend, to take the whole of it upon himself." The other cardinals, (three in number) assuring him that they would, he said, "If you are resolved to make me Pope, it will only be placing yourselves upon the throne; we must share the pontificate; for my part I shall be content with the bare title - let them call me Pope, and you are heartily welcome to the power and authority." Afterwards he told his brother cardinals, "Let me conjure you not to think of choosing me, except you will be content to bear the whole burden of the government yourselves." This was just what these cardinals wanted, and they determined to support him in the election.

The election of a Pope is performed in one of three ways; by

*scrutiny*, which resembles what we call ballot; by *access*, which is thus explained:—When one of the cardinals proposes a name, those who are for the same person rise from their seats; and go to the place where the proposer sits. The third way is by *adoration*, and is thus performed: “That cardinal who is the candidate’s chief friend, goes up to him, and making a low reverence, cries out, a Pope, a Pope! when it happens that two thirds of them do the same, he is then acknowledged as such; but if there wants only one of that number, the election is void.” Thus after a Pope elect has been adored, it is sometimes necessary to make a scrutiny, to ascertain whether he has had the requisite number of adorers. “Whilst they were crowding towards Montalto to congratulate him, he sat coughing and weeping, as if some great misfortune had befallen him. But when the Cardinal Dean ordered them to retire to their respective places, that they might proceed to a regular scrutiny, he drew near to St. Sixtus, and whispered in his ear, “Pray take care that the scrutiny is of no prejudice to the adoration;” which was the first discovery he made of his ambition. It was observed, that after the scrutiny was begun, Montalto walked backwards and forwards, and seemed to be in great agitation of spirit; but when he perceived there was a sufficient number of votes to secure his election, he threw the staff with which he used to support himself, into the middle of the chapel, stretched himself up, and appeared taller, by almost a foot, than he had done for several years, hawking and spitting with as much strength as a man of thirty years old. The cardinals, astonished at so sudden an alteration, looked at him with amazement, and Farnese, observing by some signs that St Sixtus and Alexandrino already began to repent of their forwardness in this election, said aloud, “Stay a little, softly, there is a mistake in the scrutiny.” But Montalto, with a stern look, boldly answered, “there is no mistake, the scrutiny is good, and in due form;” and immediately thundered out the *Te Deum* himself, in a voice that made the chapel shake.

The first master of the ceremonies came to him, as is usual, and said, “My Lord Cardinal Montalto, your eminence is duly elected Pope; the holy college desires to know whether you please to accept the papacy;” to which he replied, somewhat sharply, “It is trifling and impertinent to ask, whether I will accept that which I have already accepted, as I have sufficiently shewn by singing the *Te Deum*. However, to satisfy any scruple that may arise, I tell you that I accept it with great pleasure, and would accept another, if I could get it; for I find myself strong enough, by the divine assistance, to manage two papacies.

Farnese who stood near him, hearing this, said to St. Saverino, “The gentlemen that took upon them to conduct this election,

thought to have engrossed the whole administration of affairs to themselves, by choosing a fool and idiot; but I plainly see, we have got a Pope that will make fools and idiots both of them and us." St. Severino only shrugged up his shoulders, and said, "Lord have mercy on us all." Thus the poor frogs had chosen a serpent for their king, and they were not able to shake him off.

When he was asked what name he would take, he answered, Sixtus V., which he did in honour of Pope Sixtus IV., who had been a monk of the same order. It was observed, that whilst the cardinals were putting on his pontifical robes, he stretched out his arms with great vigour and activity; upon which, Rusticucci, who was surprised by such a metamorphosis, said to him in a familiar way, "I perceive, holy father, the pontificate is a sovereign panacea, since it can restore youth and health to old sick cardinals;" to which he replied, in a grave and majestic manner, "So I find it." The very moment the scrutiny was ended, he laid aside that appearance of humility he had so long worn; and instead of his former civility and complaisance, he behaved with great state and reserve to every body; but, more particularly to them to whom he had been most obliged for his exaltation.

Dressed in his robes, and seated on the pontifical throne, the cardinals advanced two and two to adore him. His Holiness gave them, separately, the kiss of charity on both cheeks; and then admitted every body who was in the conclave, to the honour of kissing his feet. It is said, when Farnese came among the rest, to perform that ceremony, he did it with great reluctance, and shewed particular signs of disgust, at prostrating himself before a person of his mean birth. Some people thought he said in his heart, "*Non tibi sed Petro*," "Not to thee, but St. Peter." Be that as it will, when he beheld him sitting so erect, and with so much majesty upon the throne, he said to him, "Your Holiness seems a quite different sort of a man from what you were a few hours ago." "Yes," said he, "I was then looking for the keys of paradise, which obliged me to stoop a little; but now I have found them, it is time to look upwards, as I am arrived at the summit of all human glory, and can rise no higher in this world."

After the adoration was finished, and other customary ceremonies performed, the Cardinal Deacon caused a window to be broken open, and then proclaimed to the people, "Behold, I bring you glad tidings of great joy, the most illustrious Cardinal Montalto is chosen Pope, and has taken the name of Sixtus V." See book iv. Life of Sixtus V; in which are many things interesting, impious, and ludicrous, which I am obliged to omit. Sixtus ruled both the cardinals and the people for several years, with a rod



of iron; but as the cardinals could not deny that he had been chosen by the Holy Ghost, and them, the moment the election was declared, they were irrevocably bound to him as their holy father. There was no possibility of getting quit of him in a lawful way; but it was suspected that he died by poison, as many other Popes are supposed to have done.

I have been thus particular in describing an individual case, and that of a Pope of comparatively good moral character, that the reader may be able to judge what title these holy fathers have to be called the successors of Peter, the vicars of Christ, and the representatives on earth of the God of peace.

Cardinal Joyeuse, writing to King Henry IV., May 19th, 1605, gives the following character of a cardinal, whose election to the Papacy he found it necessary to promote. "The Cardinal Aldobrandini, and the Cardinal Montalto, (nephew, I believe, of Sixtus V.) came to us, desiring us to join with them to make Cardinal Tosco Pope. After we had discoursed a great while on this affair, we had much ado to resolve upon it; because the said cardinal was looked upon as a man who had lived a life not too exemplary, very apt to be choleric and angry, who had always in his mouth unchaste and immodest words, and who was given to other customs, unbecoming not only the head of the church, but any person whatever, who had but the least advantage of an honest education. In short, he was a man, from whom the world could expect no good to the church; the election of whom would go against the consciences of many pious persons of the college, and might perhaps gain us nothing but disgrace and reproach from all the assembly of cardinals. Nevertheless, the little hopes that we had of having a Pope to our mind, the fear of falling on one of those who were excluded by your Majesty, the desire of not displeasing the Cardinal Aldobrandini, and the opinion which we had, that this man would be inclined to favour the affairs of your Majesty, made us resolve to assure Aldobrandini that we gave our full consent to this election." *Clarendon's Religion and Policy, or Papal Usurpations, chap. ii.* This requires no comment.

It is usual for the cardinal, who is raised to the Papacy, to assume a new name. This is said to have originated in the year 844, with one whose name was *Bocco di Porco*, that is, hog's-face, or swine-snout. When he came to the dignity of Pope, being ashamed of it, he assumed the name of Sergius. It has ever since been the custom, though there have been some exceptions, for him who is raised to the Papacy to assume a new name. For this, the following reasons are given by Popish writers: First, because Christ, when he called his apostles, changed some of their names. Secondly, to signify, that as they changed their



names, they should change also their nature." Lastly, that he who is chosen to so excellent an estate, should not be disgraced by a vile name.

Polydore Virgil, in his 4th book, *De Inventione Rerum*, cap. 10, thus writes: "The bishop of Rome hath one peculiar prerogative or privilege, which is, that when once he is created bishop of that see, he may alter and change his name at his pleasure. As, for example, if perchance he hath been heretofore an evil-doer, he may call his name Bonifacius, that is to say, well-doer. If he have been a coward, or timorous sheep's-head, he may call himself Leo, (that is, lion.) If he be a clown, he may call himself Urbanus, (a polite gentleman.) Instead of lewd, or wicked, he may call himself Pius, or Innocent. If he have been a scandalous fellow, he may assume the appellation of Benedictus, that is, well spoken of: to the end, that the sovereign bishop, at least in name, may be an ornament and honour to the dignity of the Papacy." See this, and a great deal more to the same purpose, in *The Weekly Packet of Advice from Rome*, vol. ii. pp. 309, 310.

In this work we have the following summary of the personal character of a number of Popes, which I adduce in opposition to Bishop Hay's assertion, that only a few of them were bad men in their own practice. "Some Popes have been excessively covetous; as Boniface VIII., Calixtus III., John XXIII. and Boniface IX. Some puffed up with Luciferian pride; as Bennet XII., Adrian IV., Celestine III., Innocent IV., Alexander III., Gregory XIII., Clement V., VI., and VII., Boniface VIII., Paul II., John XXIII., and many others; indeed, who not that ever wore the triple crown? Divers Popes have been conjurers, as Sylvester III., and all his successors, for nine or ten Popes together; others sold themselves by league to the devil; as Sylvester II., and Alexander VI. So many notorious whoremongers have filled the chair, that it would be too tedious to name them. Famous cheats have been Popes;—Alexander III., Boniface VIII., Celestine V., and Benedict X. Murderers were Pius IV., Gregory VII., Stephen VIII., Sixtus V., Gregory XIV., and Honorius II. Poisoners of one another;—Damasus II., Victor II., and III., Celestine IV., and Paul III., &c. &c. Vol. ii. pp. 251, 252. By sorcerers we may understand their being, at least, pretenders to the art of magic; and by having sold themselves to the devil, we may infer that such was the popular belief, and perhaps the belief of the author, founded upon the monstrous and diabolical wickedness of these *holy* fathers, who are called by the title of *holiness* itself. Perhaps the idea of men's selling themselves to the devil may have originated in the words of Elijah to Ahab, 1 Kings xxi. 20.) "Thou hast sold thyself to work evil in the

sight of the Lord." But, in order to this, it is not necessary that there be a personal contract, or league, between the devil and them.

In the above summary, I find Sixtus V. classed among the Popes who were murderers; but I do not recollect any incident in his history that entitles him to this, except what was common to him with all tyrants in power. He made very little account of human life, and ordered men to be destroyed at his pleasure. The following incident affords a view of his cruel decision of character, though it did not extend to actual murder: Pasquin (the statue so called, on which what were called pasquinades, were stuck), was dressed, one morning, in a very dirty shirt; and being asked by Marforio, "Why he wore such dirty linen?" answered, "He could get no other, for the Pope had made his washer-woman a princess." Meaning Donna Camilla, the Pope's sister, who had formerly been a laundress. This stinging piece of raillery was carried to his Holiness, who ordered strict search for the author, but to no purpose. He issued a proclamation, offering the author 1000 pistoles, and promising to spare his life, if he would discover himself; and threatening to hang him if he was found out by any body else. The poor author was so tempted by the offer, as to go, and make full confession to the Pope, who ordered the 1000 pistoles to be immediately paid. "We promised you your life; and 1000 pistoles," said his Holiness, "you have received both, and say you are satisfied: but we reserved to ourselves the power of cutting off your hands, and boring your tongue through, to prevent your being so witty for the future." Which was directly executed: Sixtus declaring, "that he did not deserve the punishment so much for the pasquinade, as for being so audacious as to avow it." *Life of Pope Sixtus V. page 395.*

On the wickedness of the Popes there is matter for many volumes, but it is time that I take up another subject. To those who wish to read in detail what I have given in the gross, I recommend the following works, some of which I have not seen, but they are recommended by a learned correspondent, who has been long engaged in the same warfare. Welch's Compendious History of Popes, London, 1759. The History of Popery, 2 vols. 4to., London, 1735. Another History of Popery, 2 vols., London, 1679; entitled also, Weekly Packet from Rome. This is a work of both arguments and facts, and it contains a great deal of curious matter. Bower's History of the Popes, 7 vols. 4to., London, 1750-66. Lord Clarendon's Papal Usurpations, or Religion and Policy, 2 vols. 8vo., Oxford, 1791. Foulis's History of Romish Treachery and Usurpations; and the Romish Horse Leech; besides such histories as Mosheim, Milner, &c., which are known to all.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CIX.

---

SATURDAY, AUGUST 12th, 1820.

---

At the conclusion of my 107th Number, I requested the reader to consider what would be the consequence, if we had one or two hundred Papists in our houses of parliament. It has been said, that this is putting a case that could not be realized, even supposing "Catholic Emancipation" were granted in all the extent that is demanded; because, it is said, there are not so many Papists qualified, or eligible to seats in parliament, though they were laid open to them. This, I am persuaded, is a mistake; and I have not a doubt, that if they were made eligible, upwards of a hundred would be found in the first parliament that should meet after the privilege was extended to them.

Ireland sends just a hundred members to the house of commons. Papists boast that their number there is to that of Protestants, as five to one; but I will take it as only four to one; and taking this as proper data by which to calculate the number of representatives, the Papists would return eighty of the hundred. And then there are the popish peers in both England and Ireland who would claim seats in the upper house; besides the English commoners whose return might be effected by the Papists in England. That Papists would elect none but men of their own faith cannot be doubted; and such is the influence of the priests over the people, that the ghostly fathers would be virtually the electors. This indeed I am informed on good authority, is, in some measure, the case already. Since the Papists in Ireland obtained the privilege of electing members of parliament, though they can elect none but Protestants, the priests have risen amazingly in importance; because the Protestant candidates must pay court to them, in order to secure the votes of the people; and we may easily imagine, that few will be found hardy enough to give a vote contrary to the mind of the priest, seeing he is believed to hold the fate of every soul in his hand. We cannot be surprised that many of the Irish members are advocates of what is called "Emanci-



pation," seeing their election may have depended upon their declaring themselves on that side ; but if they were not very short sighted they might see, that the parliament that shall concede what is demanded with so much clamour, will be the last parliament for them. In vain would they apply to the people, or to the priests to be returned again, unless they should become Papists ; for no Papist would vote for a Protestant, if there remained a qualified Papist in the three kingdoms. If Ireland should not contain a sufficient number of persons so qualified, there are great plenty to be found among the sons of Popish peers, and the inferior gentry of the same communion in England and Scotland, who would be as eligible to be returned for Ireland, as if they belonged to that kingdom.

For the information of the reader, I insert the following statement of the number and condition of the adherents of Rome, in England, in the year 1813. It is given, on the authority of the Dublin Evening Post, in the Orthodox Journal for January 1814. It is said to have been obtained through the channel of a Liverpool gentleman " of eminent character and intelligence ;" but as it is evident that the writer belongs to the body about which he writes, and to which he may be supposed a little partial, we ought to receive his account of the respectability, and superior morality of his brethren, with some grains of allowance.

## ENGLISH CATHOLICS.

(*From the Dublin Evening Post.*)

The extraordinary progress which the cause of the Catholics of Ireland has made within the last few years, through the talent and prudence of its leaders, has incidentally brought forth the Catholics of England to public notice. This body of men has not yet thoroughly recovered from the languor and depression inflicted by the penal laws ; and their apparent *inertio* may be accounted for by the habits of despondency, which frequent insults and aggressions had wrought upon them.

Events, however, are now dissipating this gloom : and the approaching Session is likely to render their movements a subject of general attention.

Our anxiety to procure useful and authentic information for our readers, upon every subject connected with the cause of Religious Freedom, has led us to a diligent inquiry into the present condition of the English Catholic Body, and we have been fortunate enough to obtain, through the channel of a correspondent in Liverpool, of eminent character and intelligence, the following statement upon which we can perfectly rely.



The subject is somewhat new and original—the ground hitherto unbroken—and the matter various and detailed.

The total number of Catholics in England and Wales is computed to exceed 300,000. The principal Catholic counties are Lancashire, Yorkshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and Northumberland. These, with Durham, Cheshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Kent, and Worcestershire, (the next in number) contain about 200,000. London and its suburbs, with Surrey and Middlesex, are rated at 50,000. The remaining 50,000 are thinly scattered throughout the other counties and cities—but chiefly in Bristol, Bath, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Southampton, Exeter, Gloucester, and a few watering places.

Some compute the total number at 400,000, and this we cannot positively contradict; but we rely with more confidence upon the proportionate population of the respective districts, as above given, than upon our computation of the aggregate amount.

Their classes are three—Clergy, Nobility, and Commoners—and each forms a venerable, though decayed, monument of ancient worth and respectability!

I. CLERGY—They have ceased, during upwards of two centuries, to possess any regular hierarchy. There are no bishops or priests, as in Ireland, officiating in appropriate dioceses or parishes. They are governed, in spirituals, by four superiors, called vicars apostolic; these vicars are deputed by the Pope, and exercise vicarial powers revocable at pleasure. They are, indeed, bishops in the Catholic Church, but do not enjoy episcopal authority in Britain; their sees are little more than nominal, or “*in partibus*,” as it is termed—as *Centurien*, *Castaballa*, &c. Each vicar has a district, therefore, assigned to him, not a see.

Thus, Dr. Gibson in the Northern; Dr. Milner in the Midland; Dr. Poynter in the London; and Dr. Collingridge in the Western district.

In like manner each priest has a separate district; not, however, any particular parish, but a “Mission,” and he is termed a “Missionary!” He acts by virtue of a faculty, granted by the apostolic vicar of the district, and is removable at his pleasure.

In Ireland, on the contrary, where the regular succession has been preserved, no bishop is removable at the mere will of the Pope—nor is any parish priest removable at the mere will of his Bishop. To effect such removal, there must exist a canonical cause, an accuser, a regular trial, sentence, and ratification.

It will be recollected, that Lord Redesdale, (in his speech in the Lords, in May, 1803,) took upon him to state roundly, that the Catholic clergy in Ireland were wholly dependant upon the

Pope; and in England, quite independent; a proof, amongst many, of his Lordship's incaution and want of knowledge.

In every county of England there are Catholic chapels and congregations. Altogether there are about 900 chapels, mostly erected within the last twenty-five years; and generally clean, commodious, and well built. Lancashire alone counts upwards of one hundred Catholic chapels. Moreover, most of the Catholic country gentlemen of fortune maintain chapels in their houses. Service is performed daily in the private chapel, and the traveller is freely admitted to assist at the office.

In the summer 1813, Dr. Smith, (the Vicar-Assistant to the venerable Dr. Gibson,) in the Northern district, confirmed the following numbers of Catholic children, in three towns alone:

In Manchester	-	-	-	-	800
— Liverpool	-	-	-	-	1000
— Preston	-	-	-	-	1200

Hence some estimate may be formed of the Catholic population of England.

II. PEERS.—The Catholic peers are seven in number, viz.

	<i>Created</i>		<i>Created</i>
1. Earl of Shrewsbury, Premier and Earl of Waterford and Wexford in Ireland	- 1442	4. Baron Petre	- 1603
2. Viscount Fauconberg	- 1643	5. Baron Arundel	- 1605
3. Baron Stourton	- 1448	6. Baron Dormer	- 1615
		7. Baron Clifford	- 1672

The presumptive heir to the dukedom of Norfolk \* is also a Catholic. In Scotland there are two Catholic earls—Traquair and Newburgh.

The Catholic baronets of England are seventeen in number: namely—

	<i>Created</i>		<i>Created</i>
Sir Wm. Gerard, Lancashire	1611	Sir Thos. Webbe, Wiltshire	1644
Sir Edward Hales, Kent	- 1611	Sir R. Smythe, Warwickshire	1669
Sir Henry Englefield, Berks	1612	Sir Rich. Bedingfeld, Norfolk	1661
Sir G. Jerningham, Norfolk	1621	Sir T. Massey Stanly, Cheshire	1661
Sir Henry Tichborne, Hants	1628	Sir Thos. Gage, Suffolk	- 1662
Sir John Throckmorton, Berks	1641	Sir John Lawson, Yorkshire	
Sir Edward Blount, Shropshire	1642	Sir H. Maire, Lawson, Yorks.	1665
Sir Windsor Hunloke, Derbys.	1645	Sir Piere Martyn, Flintshire	1670
Sir Carn. Haggerston, Lincolns.	1645		

The principal names which have dropped off lately, either by deaths or conformity, have been those of Howard, Duke of Norfolk; Browne, Lord Montague; Roper, Lord Teynham; Vavasour, Curzon, Acton, Mannock, Gascoigne, Fleetwood, Swinburne—all Peers or Baronets.

\* The present duke.

Amongst the English Catholics are many ancient families, of name and renown in English history. Their present heads are mostly country gentlemen, retired, reserved; of sedentary, and nearly secluded habits of life. Such are the names of Constable, Clifford, Weld, Howard, Plowden, Townley, Jones, Stapleton, Carey, Stonor, Eyre, Heneage, Stanley, Turberville, Selby, Browne, Tunstall, Eyston, Errington, Chichester, Chomley, Giffard, Tasborough Biddulph, Eccleston, Huddleston, Berrington, Charlton, Dalton, Sheldon, Perrers, Canning, Berkely, Manby, Riddall, Darell, Fermor, Trafford, Weston, &c. &c. &c.

There are about five hundred of these Catholic families, not inferior to many in the British Peerage in ancient, pure, and noble lineage—some, who can boast the legitimate Plantagenet blood—several who enjoy landed estates, lineally transmitted since the Norman days, and even the Saxon era. These, though not now titled, may be classed by the herald amongst nobility. The heads of these families mostly live retired upon patrimonial incomes, varying in annual value from £1500 to £25,000.

It may appear curious to those who know the name of Giffard in Ireland only, that the parent stock in England is wholly Catholic. The Giffards of Chillington, in Staffordshire, possess landed estates of £8000 a year, and upwards; and of this family is Sir John Throckmorton's lady, the elegant and accomplished correspondent of the pathetic poet, Cowper.

III. COMMONERS.—We have spoken of the clergy, nobility, and higher classes of the English Catholic Body. The inferior orders are little distinguishable from the corresponding classes of their Protestant neighbours (or *Churchmen*, as they are termed).

Here the broad features of distinction almost disappear—Industry, association, necessity, obliterate the characteristic traits. Generally speaking, they are little farmers, shopkeepers, artists, and labourers—decent, humble, timid, shy, and careful. It is supposed that they are rather more moral, regular, submissive, and inoffensive, than their neighbours; and also of a more sedate and stationary habit of life. Emigrations from their parishes, pauperism, and crimes, are said to be rare amongst them.

There may be some foundation for this eulogium; but, whether it is due to the control of vigilant censors, to a guarded purity of deportment, to a more moral system of education, to the virtuous precepts of their religion, or to accident, we do not venture to determine.

Wales affords but few Catholics—a singular fact of a race, in lesser points, obstinately wedded to ancient usage.

Wales, separated from England only by hedges and streams, remains profoundly ignorant of the English language, and clings to her own, with all the jealousy of national pride.

Yet, Wales ceded her ancient religion, (without scruple or he-



sitation) to a people, whose language she still disdains to understand. She drinks, with delicious rapture, of every stream that flows from English eccentricity; and neither the mummary of the Jumpers, nor the frenzy of the Ezekielites, renders the spiritual potion too muddy for the ardent and enthusiastic Welchman.

The author of the above statement considers it "a singular fact," that "Wales affords but few Catholics," while the Welch are said to be "a race, in lesser points, obstinately wedded to ancient usage." Now, perhaps, this is the very circumstance that accounts for the fact. The "ancient usage," with regard to religious worship, in Wales, was certainly not Popish worship, or any thing like Popery. The religion of Rome was a mere novelty in that ancient principality. It could not have existed there many centuries before the Reformation; and, therefore, when the Reformation delivered the Welch from the thralldom of the ghostly intruders, in the form of Romish priests, they would gladly return to their more ancient usages.

Britain, there is reason to think, was favoured with the light of Christianity as early as the first century. I do not state this as a matter of absolute certainty; but as one of great probability; and I have never seen any thing that renders it incredible. There is extant a writing ascribed to Clemens, the fellow-labourer of the apostle Paul, in which he says that Paul, in preaching the gospel, went to the *utmost bounds of the west*. (Το τελευτα της δυσεως, *terminum, finem occidentis*, the extremity of the west,) which may very properly apply to the British isles, which were the western extremity of the Roman empire. The expression does not necessarily mean the most western part in point of longitude; but the most remote part in a western direction. Eusebius, in the fourth century, says, that the gospel was preached in the British isles by some of the apostles. He, of course, could not speak from his own knowledge; but he must have had such evidence as satisfied him of the fact. Tertullian, in the second century, says, that before his time Christianity had extended itself to parts of Britain, inaccessible to the Roman arms. These must have been the mountainous parts of Wales and Scotland, into which the Romans were not able to penetrate. Gildas says, that the gospel was preached in Britain *before the defeat of Boadicca*, which took place in the year 61; and the British Triads state, that the knowledge of Christianity was brought to Britain by the father of Caractacus, who was liberated from his detention at Rome seven years after the defeat of Caractacus, that is, A. D. 58 or 59, the time in which (according to Eusebius, Jerome, Petavius, Scaliger, &c.) Paul was set at liberty from his first confinement at Rome. See the Bishop of St. David's Protestant Catechism, Section viii.

These things are not asserted as divine truths. They are not so certain, as that we can build an article of faith upon them, as the Church of Rome builds her monstrous fabric upon the assertion that Peter was the first bishop of that city, of which there is much less evidence than that Paul preached the gospel in England. But though we cannot assert the above as matters of divine record, they are credible articles of history, and sufficiently authentic for my present purpose, which is to show that Popery was not the religion of the ancient Britons from whom the Welch are descended.

Assuming the above facts as matter of credible history, (and they have never been shown to be fabulous) the learned prelate above mentioned, in a letter to Lord Kenyon, 1819, writes as follows:—"To the labours and preaching of the great apostle of the Gentiles, we are indebted for the first introduction of the gospel. Of its existence to the beginning of the fourth century, we have the testimony of Tertullian, Origen, and Gildas. Public councils and synods, and religious institutions, attest its continuance in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries.—The rejection of the Pope's authority (by the Church of England) in the seventh century, stamps the first feature of its *Protestant* character. Its observance of Easter, its aversion to image worship, and its vernacular version of the scriptures, show its independence on the Church of Rome during the Saxon government, down to the Norman conquest." pp. 2, 3.

Now, long before this period, the ancient British had been driven by their Saxon invaders, to take refuge among the mountains of Wales. They carried their language and their religion with them. Considering their many disadvantages, it is not to be supposed that they preserved, or professed Christianity, in every point, pure as it was received from the apostles; but it was long ere they submitted to Rome. Popery was a novelty to them; and though forced upon them for a time, they readily threw it off when they were favoured by the light of the Reformation. This is what our Popish eulogist calls ceding their ancient religion, without scruple or hesitation, to a people whose language they still disdain to understand. It was rather throwing their idols to the moles and to the bats, and returning to the religion of their remote ancestors.

If it shall be replied, that St. Wenefride is a Welch saint of great antiquity, and that she belonged to the Church of Rome; I answer, we have no credible evidence of this. That which we have as her life, was written hundreds of years after the period in which she is said to have lived; and when nothing of her character or history could be known with certainty. I will not deny, that there may have lived a noble lady of that name, distinguished for piety and benevolence; and that her memory may have been

held in veneration for ages. Some idle monk taking advantage of this, would collect all the stories that were current among the people; and, with the aid of a lively imagination, he could easily dress up such a legend as that which we have under the title of the Life and Miracles of St. Wenefride. Scott of Dunse, commonly called Duns Scotus, was, no doubt, a learned and great man in his day; but among the common people in the south of Scotland, he is known only as Michael Scott the *warlock*, (*wizard*) and as such is the subject of many silly and absurd stories, which are as remote from real history, as the miracles of Wenefride, *the saint*.

It may be true, that some extravagance is exhibited in the worship of certain sects in Wales, which every sober Protestant will lament and condemn; but I venture to affirm, that the folly of the Jumpers and Ezekielites, be they who they may, is not greater than that of many in the Church of Rome, who have been canonized, and who are at this day worshipped as saints.

If we may judge of the morality of Papists, from that which comes under our own eye in this city and neighbourhood, we shall be very far indeed from supposing, like the writer of the foregoing statement, "that they are rather more moral, submissive, and inoffensive, than their neighbours; and also of a more sedate and stationary habit of life." In every point, the very reverse of this is the truth, except, perhaps, in the article of being submissive, in which so far as regards submission to their priests, we must yield to them the superiority. Candour, however, requires me to admit, that Glasgow does not afford a specimen, by which we can fairly judge of the morality of Papists in the southern part of the island, or even of the north. We have few, if any, of native growth. Where men are born, and grow up, and settle in life, there are certain ties of neighbourhood, and acquaintanceship, and friendship, which form a kind of check upon their conduct. No one can become notoriously wicked, without danger of being cast off by his more respectable neighbours, and of being obliged to leave the place. Perhaps not one in ten of our Popish population have this advantage of old local acquaintanceship. The increase of our manufactures, and the demand for labour in building, during the rapid enlargement of our city, attracted thousands from the sister island. These were generally of the poorest class, without the knowledge of any thing, beyond a few articles of their wretched superstition; who had the fewest inducements to remain at home, and who have the fewest motives to distinguish themselves by superior good conduct. By the influx of such, our poor's rates have been grievously augmented; and the morality of the lower orders, the very reverse of being improved.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CX.

---

SATURDAY, AUGUST 19th, 1820.

---

REMARKING upon the statement in my last Number, relating to "English Catholics," and the allegation, that they are, in respect of morals, superior to their neighbours, I observed it was otherwise in this part of the kingdom; but I admitted that it was not quite fair to judge of the English stock, by the Irish sample which is exhibited to our view in this city and its neighbourhood. Where families have been long settled, and where circumstances are more favourable, we reasonably expect to find a more respectable body: but even, where circumstances are most favourable for insuring good conduct, and where the adherents of Rome have the advantage of good education, and of intercourse with enlightened society, I will not admit that they are more moral than Christians of any denomination whatever. It is customary to call those who have no religion at all, of the established religion, whatever it may be. Thus a great proportion of our population are called Protestants who have no right to the appellation; it is not even thought worth while to deny it to the most sensual and profligate part of the community, though *heathens* would be a more appropriate term; for they are idolaters in the grossest sense of the word—"whose god is their belly." It may be admitted, that the morality of Papists in England, like that of every other sect whose numbers are comparatively small, in the midst of an enlightened population, will be superior to that of persons whom no Christian sect would acknowledge. If we would make a fair estimate of the moral effects of the two systems, we must look at the mass of the people where each predominates; and, I am sure, Britain, with all its faults, will not shrink from a comparison with France or Italy, or any Popish country in the world:—not even with "Catholic Ireland," "the island of saints."

An inclination to magnify their numbers is a vice of which Papists are notoriously guilty. Thus a writer in Glasgow, who took the signature of Julius, and who writes very much like Amicus

Veritatis, in a letter in the *Orthodox Journal*, for March last, made an indecent attack on Mr. Cleland, for giving, as he said, an unfair statement of the number belonging to his communion in this city and suburbs. Mr. Cleland published first the census of the city alone, in which he gave the number of "Roman Catholics," (for he was polite enough not to call them Papists,) at 3997. This was avowedly given as the number within the royalty only: But Julius published it as the number given for both city and suburbs; and triumphantly boasted, that instead of between 3 and 4000, there were near 15,000 Catholics in Glasgow and its vicinity. This was answered, in the Newspapers, by one of the Committee, under whose direction the census had been taken, who stated, that after the enumeration of the suburbs had been completed, the total number in both city and suburbs was found to be 8245. This was far from satisfying Julius; for he soon after published a letter in the *Glasgow Courier*, in which he asserted the number to be 20,000; and referred to the Rev. Mr. Scott, by name, whom, he said, he had often heard, both in public and private, declare this to be the number; and, moreover, referred to lists of names in Mr. Scott's possession, as a proof of the fact. The reverend Gentleman, however, authorized the editor to contradict this assertion, which was done in the *Courier*, for May 11th, and to declare, that if ever he used the expression 20,000, in reference to persons of his communion, he must have included Lanarkshire, Renfrewshire, Dumbartonshire, Stirlingshire, and Linlithgowshire; and that the list of names in his possession, of persons belonging to all these counties, never exceeded from 2 to 3000. Julius was silent, for he had not the grace to acknowledge his error, though exposed by his own priest.

But, contrary to usual practice, the writer of the statement in my last Number, I think, estimates the number of his communion in England and Wales sufficiently low, in 1813, at 300,000; and as there were 900 chapels, there must have been an average of only 333 souls, or about 200 grown persons to each, according to Mr. Cleland's Tables of the population here, which exhibit about one person under 12 years to every three and a fraction. There must, therefore, have been little occasion for building more chapels; and yet we know that several large ones have been built since the above date, among which are those in Glasgow, and Moorfields, London; which two would contain the 50th part of the adult Popish population of England and Wales, according to the above statement.

After all that I have written against the Church of Rome, I find there are but few of the children of that holy communion, who are willing to stand forward in her defence. If she were the

only true church, or even the mother and mistress of all churches, for she gives herself out under both characters. it might be expected, that some of her beneficed and well qualified sons would endeavour to defend her from the attacks of an arch heretic of the nineteenth century. She is plainly and explicitly by him held up to the world, as the mother of abominations; and yet her consecrated sons, who have the greatest interest in throwing a veil over her bloated countenance, and in representing her as all fair, without one spot or blemish, are quietly sitting still, without so much as making an attempt to wipe off the stain that is every week thrown upon the character of their holy mother. A priest was once interrogated on this subject, and asked why he did not write an answer to *THE PROTESTANT*? he replied, with great *humility*, that he did not consider that gentleman, (who has the misfortune to be only a layman,) as his equal; and that, therefore, it would not be honourable in him to enter the lists with him; but, if any clergyman were to write against the "Catholic faith," he would perhaps write a reply. It so happened, that soon after, a minister of the established church preached in this city, and afterwards published, an admirable discourse, which struck at the very foundation of the Romish faith, by proving it to be the right and the duty of all to read the word of God. I refer to a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Hodgson of Blantyre, of which the Popish priest did not think it becoming his rank or dignity, at least not convenient, to take any public notice. Now I do wish, with all my heart, that some of our clergymen would take up the controversy upon a broader scale; not because I wish to lay it down; but that our Popish priests might have no apology for their silence. They, it seems, in the true spirit of knight-errantry, will fight with none but knights like themselves. Forty years ago there was not a Protestant minister in Scotland, Episcopal or Presbyterian, whose heart was not interested in the subject, and who did not make it his business, by preaching or writing, or both, to expose to his people the wickedness of Popery and the danger that would attend its increase; but now, when Popery is making a more imposing appearance than it did forty years ago; and when nothing less will satisfy the subjects of the Pope, than *admission* into our houses of Parliament, and *admissibility* to the throne itself, most of our clergy show, by their silence, that they feel no great interest in the subject. This is not because they are more Popishly inclined than their predecessors. It is not because they are less hostile to what is idolatrous, and superstitious, and subversive of our civil and religious liberties. It is because they have a vague imagination that Popery is not so bad as it was; at least, that Papists are not such deceivers and persecutors as they were two hundred years ago. But let them expose the errors and the wickedness of Rome, as their fathers did.



and if any Popish priest shall make a reply, they will find the very same spirit of lying, and misrepresentation, and the same persecuting malevolence, as were exhibited in the practice of Papists when they had power in their hands. Seeing the priests will not write against me, because I am not their equal, I must be content to contend with mere laymen like myself. I have a suspicion, indeed, that my Galloway "Friend to Fair Dealing," is a priest, though I am not certain of the fact; and therefore I am not entitled to boast of the honour of having a consecrated antagonist. My London lay opponent is disavowed by his own ghostly fathers, some of whom forbid their people to read his writings; because, to use a vulgar expression, he *blabs out* from time to time, the real principles, and the real spirit of Popery, in language too plain to be misunderstood; and thus makes disclosures which are extremely prejudicial to the cause of "emancipation." He has indeed written nothing against THE PROTESTANT since the month of December; and as I have promised him the honour of a chapter to himself, when I have done with every thing else, I must again pass him over, and attend to the communications of meaner men, of which I have received only two from Popish correspondents since my last notice. The first is, *verbatim et literatim*, as follows:

GREENOCK, March 27.

Dear

Sir you no When Mar Andreus was vindicating the Catholic religion of wich you are writing a Ganast you promest to a tak him as soon as you ar done With the important Matter that you are at i hope you will be as good as your word to perfrom it in due tim hover if Eney man of Jugment At all wold serch eney of your nombers they Woold not find ane worb of troch in eney of them you may say What Ever you chouse but i Woold not bleve one word that you Wold say becas you are lare and a inventar of laes i wonder that you ar not affirad that tho Ground on Witch you Stand dos Not open & Swlio you up rate ono More a Ganst the Catholic Church for she is the pillirs and Ground of truth for Cursed is he that denietit thou May Throw as Much Durt, at hir as you Chuse but thou ar oneley Ading more Sin to your Self i Wold wich you to Stop as sone as you ar done with mars Andreus - - - Rit a Anser to this if you can

I am your humbile Servint  
a liover of truth.

I dare say the writer of the above learned epistle, has long ago concluded in his own mind, that I really was not able to answer it, seeing I have allowed nearly five months to elapse without

taking any notice of it. He must have derived great pleasure from the idea of having written a letter which THE PROTESTANT could not answer; and as I have no wish to deprive him of the happiness which he enjoys, I shall leave it unanswered, and proceed to insert a letter from my old Edinburgh Correspondent, W. D. I give it also *verbatim*, but not *literatim*, as I do not choose to impose upon myself or my compositors the hardship of copying any more of such orthographical eccentricities. Justice, however, requires me to say, that W. D. is not quite so eccentric as the "lover of truth." From the rank which his letter will be esteemed to hold, as a literary composition, I might, perhaps, be excused from inserting it; but it is my wish to give my opponents every fair opportunity of being heard in their own defence, and therefore I insert it at length, though it contains a good deal of irrelevant matter, especially mutilated extracts from the writings of Luther, which have no relation to the present subjects of controversy.

## LETTER II. TO THE PROTESTANT.

*Edinburgh, 15th July, 1820.*

SIR,

In writing a second epistle, I deem it reasonable to adopt a subject of some importance, in order, if possible, to throw some light upon a point which it appears you have treated with a good deal of abuse and falsehood, in that ever memorable work, entitled, THE PROTESTANT, in the LXXXVII. No. page 290. Speaking of the degrees of sin, we are led to believe that those very crimes, the thought of which ought to make a Christian shudder with horror, are only venial in the eyes of poor stupid Papists. After the seven deadly sins, comes the six sins against the Holy Ghost, to wit: despair of salvation—presumption of God's mercy—to impugn the known truth—envy at another's spiritual good—obstinacy in sin—final impenitence; after those, follow the four sins that cry to heaven for vengeance; these are, wilful murder—sin of Sodom—oppression of the poor—to defraud servants of their wages; these ten species of sin are, as I believe, greater sins than those which are denominated deadly sins; or to speak more proper, the six sins against the Holy Ghost are more heinous than the seven deadly sins, and the four sins which cry to heaven for vengeance, are more grievous than the other thirteen; but you have the kindness to tell us that they are only venial, because they are not classed along with the deadly sins: really, Sir, I believe you were the first man that ever discovered this mystery; yet suppose you made this foolish statement, I humbly trust that none of your readers will ever see these sins in the same light as you hold them forth. But this is only one statement which shows the venomous spirit with which you treat the Roman Catholic reli-

gion, out of thousands of other ridiculous nonsense with which you amuse your readers. Had I as much time and leisure, I would devote some of my very limited talents to show that you mistake Catholics as much as any reformer that went before you ; nor can I say that you are excusable, because you have of late quoted some of the principal Catholic Works that are common among us ; but miserable must the state of that religion be, that is obliged to throw out such abuse and slander, lies, and misrepresentations of every description, to keep its ground. But Papists need not be surprised at such dealing, for it seems to be a peculiar principle of all the reformers, together with their successors, since the beginning of Protestantism, to make use of the same kind of scurrilous abusive language ; if such practice be a sin, I am afraid, Sir, that you will have a heavy account against you at the last day. You tell us plainly, that every sin deserves God's wrath and curse ; pray Sir, what part of the Bible do you find this doctrine ? Look your New Testament, Sir, and you will find there is a sin unto death, and a sin not unto death. If you would take the trouble of reading, with some attention, the 5th, the 7th, and 12th chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, you will find the degree of sin and the punishment due to them, laid down very plainly. By your late exposition of the doctrine of sin and transubstantiation, I am inclined to think that you have studied the Scriptures much the same as the renowned Martin Luther. I shall give you a few of his words concerning the interpretation of the Scripture :—" If," says the Reverend Doctor, " If God foresaw that Judas would be a traitor, Judas of necessity became a traitor, neither was it in the power of Judas, or of any other man, to do otherwise, or to change his will." *De Servo. Arb. tom. 2. fol. 460. 2.*—" This is the highest degree of faith, to believe God to be just, though by his own will he lays us under the necessity of being damned, and in such a manner too, as if he took delight in tormenting the miserable." *Fol. 434. 1.*—" Man's will is in the nature of a horse, if God sits upon it, it tends and goes as God would have it go ; if the devil rides it, it tends and goes as the devil would have it ; nor can it choose which of the riders it will run to, or seek, but the riders themselves strive who shall gain and possess it." *De Serm. Arb. tom. 2. fol. 342. 2.*—" A person that is baptized cannot, though he would, lose his salvation by any sins how grievous soever, unless he refuses to believe. For no sin can damn him but unbelief alone." *Cap. Bap. Tom. 2. fol. 74. 1.*—" Let this be your rule, where the Scripture commands the doing a good work, understand it in this sense, that it forbids thee to do a good work because thou canst not do it." *Tom. 3. fol. 171. 2.*—This is no doubt a most excellent rule to interpret the sacred Scriptures, and I suppose Dr. Martin was the first inventor of it. You seem to think by a letter you got from a " Friend to Fair-deal-



ing," and Mr. Andrews likewise, and all others, I suppose, that has said any thing against your own opinion, wishes to divert you off your plan, and turn your attention to something else, for **THE PROTESTANT** has a plan laid down which he intends to follow without interruption; pray Sir, when did you form this plan? At the beginning of your publication you promised to follow them (the Papists) through all their windings and turnings, but lo! when **THE VINDICATOR** came forth, behold **THE PROTESTANT** has got a plan which he must follow; for my own part, and I dare say I may say in the name of others, I would not wish, by any means, to take you off your plan; take up any point of Catholic faith, and I shall be ready to contest it with you to the last, if you keep within the bounds of reason. I am really surprised, Sir, that you would make use of such fabulous nonsensical stories as you generally do. Only look back to the beginning of the subject of Purgatory, and look at the fable about Purgatory Bridge being broken; really, Sir, if this story be true, I am very sorry for it, and as I am informed that you are a man of charity, I trust you will contribute your mite to have the bridge repaired again; or if it were rather dear, perhaps a good steam-boat would answer the purpose equally well, if the renowned Wallace, or the celebrated Rob Roy could be conveyed over, it would be doing a good and charitable turn for poor papists, to get them over dry shod; perhaps you will think my remark foolish, but truly, I can think of none better to answer the admirable statement. Now, Sir, I wish to have an earnest word with you, and then I will close; in your remarks upon my last letter, you mentioned so far, as that you "expected some good of this person," (myself). I most cordially thank you Sir, and I hope you will not be disappointed; but you have not as yet brought me sufficient proof, that the Church of Rome was guilty of all these bloody tricks of which you accuse her; nor have you ever told me who invented the doctrines she holds, or when she ceased from being true and genuine; this, Sir, I am afraid you cannot answer; you seem to question, if ever I saw the writings of the fathers which I quoted in my last, or if I could even read them; indeed, Sir, I never did see their writings, and I am sure I could not read them, although I did see them, and I question if you could read them either, that is to say, the manuscripts which they wrote with their own hands; I might question you the same, when you quote the Bible or the Ten Commandments, I might ask if you ever saw the parchment upon which the Prophets and Patriarchs wrote them, and even suppose you saw them, how could you demonstrate that they wrote them? You believe the Ten Commandments to be given to Moses upon two tables of stone by Almighty God himself, but did you ever see these tables, or did you see God write them? I suppose not, but tell me, are they less true, suppose you nor I never saw them; I

have seen what is said to be wrote by them, in print, and I believe any thing of that kind when I have good authority for it ; but yet I do not put any writings, whatever, on a level with the Bible, I believe every word of it, from the first of Genesis to the end of the Revelations, to be the infallible word of God ; you was good enough to give me your good advice to return to the Church of Scotland ; but why to the Church of Scotland more than any other ? More than the church to which you belong yourself ? If you be in the right, the Church of Scotland must be wrong, for if there be a word of truth in the Holy Scriptures, there can only be one true church on earth among the thousands that are spread among us ; for it is merely impossible that Almighty God should reveal one religion to one people, and a contrary one to another : that is a mystery I shall never be able to swallow, suppose I hear it very often from men of good education, and even from the pulpits. I hope, Sir, if you give any notice to what I have said, that you will be so good as to give me your advice which church to adopt as my guide, in which I am to serve my Maker here on earth, as the most certain foundation, and likewise your reasons for advising me to follow one more than another. It appears that you discovered in my last, that I did not possess a quiet conscience in the Church of Rome ; I cannot understand how you could discover this to be the case, for I only said, that “ if you can prove the Church of Rome to be in an error in any one point of faith, I shall leave her as soon as I see my proof,” and you may rely upon it I shall keep my word, but I cannot say that I have seen that proof as yet, nor do I expect to see it, but if I shall, I will keep my promise good. I presume that I discovered an error in one of your numbers sometime ago, in giving us some of the regulations of a certain Society in Ireland, about praying for the dead ; there was a passage quoted from St. John, which I suppose was misquoted by the composers of the Rules, it was as follows :—“ let us not love in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth ;” these words was not given from the right chapter and verse, indeed, but you made a note in the margin to contradict this passage, saying, “ in vain shall the reader look for such a passage in the common English Bible,” look your New Testament, Sir, which is of equal authority, and you will find it in the 3d chapter, and 18th verse, of the first Epistle of St. John the Divine. If you publish this letter, I wish to correct a word which was wrong in my last, speaking of predestination in the 70th No. of the PROT. instead of “ why are we in the esteem,” read “ why are we denied the esteem.” I am sorry want of room prevents me from saying any more at present.—Farewell. WM D.

THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CXI.

---

SATURDAY, AUGUST 26th, 1820.

---

I HAD not room, in the last Number, for any remarks on the communication of W. D.; but, in the present, I hope to be able to answer every thing that requires particular notice. Though he be only a recent convert from the Church of Scotland, as he told us in his former letter, he can misquote and misrepresent as expertly as if he had been born a Papist. In my 80th Number, page 236, I inserted a Popish advertisement, with this motto, "Let us love not in word or in tongue, but in deed and in truth, 1 John 10 ch. 18 v." and inserted as a note, "The reader will look in vain for such a *chapter and verse* in the common English Bible;" that is, he will look in vain for the 18th verse of the 10th chapter of 1 John. But W. D. gives as my words, "in vain shall we look for *such a passage* in the common English Bible." He says, I "made a note in the margin *to contradict this passage*;" and he gravely tells me where to find it, supposing I did not know that there were such words in the New Testament. Now I appeal to W. D. himself, whether this be not barefaced imposition? and if he has the effrontery to misquote my own words to my own face, what dependence can we have upon the accuracy of his quotations from so scarce a book as the works of Luther? This book, I am persuaded, he never saw. The few extracts which he gives must have been taken from some Popish writer, who had taken them from some other, so that they may have come through twenty hands since they were taken from the original; and no dependence can be placed upon the veracity of any one of the reporters. In my 2d Number I showed how Amicus Veritatis had garbled the words of the same Reformer, so as completely to misrepresent his meaning; and I have since found, that what Amicus Veritatis gave as a discovery of his own, was a mere copy from other books. His very words are to be found in a book published in England, about ten



years ago;\* and I find the very same misquotation of Luther's words in a book published in the reign of James I. Yes, the very "*adveniat ancilla*," with a period instead of a comma, and the entire omission of that part of the sentence which explains the author's meaning, may be seen not only in the above modern publication, but also in the work of one Francis Walsingham, printed 1609, in which the garbled half sentence is given in English, as the entire and fully expressed doctrine of the Reformer. Perhaps fifty later Popish Authors have taken it upon the authority of the said Walsingham; and so the lie has passed from one to another, till it fell to the lot of THE PROTESTANT to detect it, by reference to the authentic publication of Luther, in the library of our University. The same detection may, indeed, have been made by other authors whose writings I have not seen.

But we need not be surprised that such writers as W. D. should misquote and misrepresent the words of other people, for he actually does the same injustice to his own, in order that he may disengage himself from a dilemma into which he had fallen, by an expression in his former letter. He says, at the conclusion of his second:—"It appears that you discovered, in my last, that I did not possess a quiet conscience in the Church of Rome. I cannot understand how you could discover this to be the case, for I *only* said, if you can prove the Church of Rome to be in error in any point, I shall leave her as soon as I see any proof."—Here he breaks off in the middle of a sentence of his own, and leaves out that part of it on which my remark was founded, which was this:—"for I am but a late convert from the Church of Scotland, in which I was educated from my youth, and if I thought *it possible to obtain salvation in any other*, (i. e. than the Church of Rome) *I would not be another day in her communion*," &c. It was upon his words, which I have here printed in Italics, that I founded the remark, that W. D. was heartily tired of the communion of his church, seeing he would not remain in her another day, if it *were possible* to obtain salvation in any other. If any man were to say, I would not lodge another day in this house, if it were possible to obtain another to accommodate my family, who would not infer that he was heartily tired of his present residence?

There are several things in my correspondent's letter too trifling to require an answer; such as, when did I form the plan of my Work? It is of more importance to attend to his promise; or what, perhaps, he means as a threat, in these words, "Take up

\* A Vindication of the Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham, page 45.

any point of Catholic faith, and I shall be ready to contest it with you to the last, if you keep within the bounds of reason." Now I must give my correspondent a piece of information which will surprise him:—It never was my intention to contest with him, or any body else, any point of "*catholic* faith;" that is, any doctrine which the universal church of Christ,—the whole body of real Christians, in all ages, have derived from the word of God. This is what is properly called catholic faith; and so far from contesting, it is my purpose to maintain it to the last. It requires no small degree of effrontery in the vassals of Rome, to call themselves Catholics, and their sect the Catholic Church: yet, through mere indifference, this has been conceded to them by most Protestants, in writing and conversation, for half a century. This has given them a vast advantage in their endeavours to corrupt ignorant persons, with whom names have often more weight than things. It is one of their tricks to turn up what is called the Apostles' Creed, which is acknowledged to be a composition of great antiquity, to quote the words, "holy catholic church," in which Protestants profess to believe; and triumphantly to appeal to the language of our own profession, as an admission that the Church of Rome is the true Church. Ignorant people, who never hear the word *catholic* applied to any church but that of Rome, are very apt to stumble and be deceived by this inconsistency in the language of Protestants, and the advantage which Papists take of it. I hope this most teasing and tormenting work of mine, to give it no worse name, will have this among other important effects, to restore the legitimate word *Papist* to its place in our vocabulary. It was used by Popish writers themselves, without scruple, a hundred and fifty years ago; and it would be so still, if they did not wish to conceal from Protestants, the real nature of their dependence upon the Pope.

I am aware, however, that W. D. means the faith of Rome; but then, what becomes of his promise, or threat, to contest every point with me? He speaks as if I had not yet entered upon the controversy; as if he were waiting till I should begin, that he might begin his defence. Now he certainly knows, that I have taken up, and at least endeavoured to refute, many a point of Romish faith. Under the heads of Transubstantiation, and Purgatory, the Supremacy of Peter, and of the Pope, &c. &c. I have endeavoured to expose some fundamental articles of the faith of Rome, as no better than the invention of the devil. Why is it that he has not entered upon the contest, as he says he is ready to do? He makes a condition, indeed, by which, perhaps, he will justify himself; that is, if I "keep within the bounds of reason;" but he must prove that I have exceeded these bounds, before he can lawfully declare off. This he has not done, nor even

attempted to do. I insist, therefore, upon his fulfilling his engagement, to "contest every point with me to the last;" and he must do something more than merely assert that I misrepresent the faith of his church; and that misrepresenting has been the practice of all the Reformers. I know it has been the practice of all Papists to say so; but if it really were so, nothing could be easier than to prove it. It is sometimes difficult to expose a quibble or a sophism, in intelligible language; but a misrepresentation may be exposed in a moment, by any person who understands the subject of it. If, for instance, it were a misrepresentation to say that a Papist worships, as his God, that which his eyes and other senses tell him is but a piece of bread, in the form of a wafer, it could instantly be corrected by giving the real doctrine of the church as laid down by her authorized standards; and so with regard to any other point: but neither W. D. nor any other writer, has yet shown, by a single example, that I have so misrepresented the faith of Rome. I hold it then as good as admitted, that I have given a true representation of it.

He objects to my statement and remarks upon the different degrees of sin, as taught in the Douay Catechism; but does little more than state an objection. He adduces neither argument nor fact to prove that I had mistaken the meaning of the Catechism, in which we have a list of seven sins which are called deadly, and two classes of other sins which are distinguished from those that are deadly. What could I infer from this, but that those which are distinguished from deadly sins are not deadly ones? W. D. tells me that it is not so understood by him and his brethren; but then I must tell him that he does not understand the meaning of words. I might as well say that when Papists are spoken of as distinguished from Protestants, it is not understood that the one class of persons is different from the other. He tells us, indeed, that the sins which are distinguished from the deadly, are more heinous and more grievous than the deadly ones. I did not know before that there was any thing worse than deadly; any thing beyond the eternal death which sin deserves. I have seen no such doctrine in any of the authorized standards of his Church; and must suppose it is merely a private opinion of W. D., which is of no authority whatever.

I do certainly maintain that every sin is deadly in its own nature, and by the righteous judgment of God. The smallest deviation from the divine law is disobedience as really as the greatest. Yet I believe there is no sin so deadly as that the mercy of God cannot pardon it, or that the blood of Christ cannot cleanse from it. Without pretending to speak peremptorily on a difficult subject, I am inclined to think, that our Lord's words, with re-



gard to the sin against the Holy Ghost, had a special reference to the malignant rejection of the Saviour, by the Jews, after they had seen his miracles, and witnessed the effects of the descent of the Holy Spirit after his resurrection. Be this as it may, we are warranted from the whole tenor of the gospel to say, that no sin which any man has committed shall not be forgiven, if he shall come to Christ for forgiveness. Final impenitence is a deadly sin, in every sense of the expression, though the Church of Rome has not put it into that list; for he that is guilty of it, shuts himself up, absolutely and for ever, out of the reach of mercy. W. D. cites the words of the apostle John, (1 Epist. v. 17.) "There is a sin unto death, and a sin *not* unto death," to defend the Popish distinction between venial and mortal sins. If the apostle had said there is a sin that does not deserve death, or is not in its nature deadly, he would have given countenance to the Popish doctrine; but this was impossible, for it would have been contrary to the whole tenor of the word of God, which cannot contradict itself. What the apostle says, is true of every sin for which a sinner obtains repentance,—it is not unto death; but sin unrepented of, is unto death; and as such, is not to be prayed for, according to the words of the same apostle, in the immediately preceding verse. Final impenitence, or impenitence to death, is, I suppose, the only thing which fellow creatures are warranted to call sin unto death: and the apostle's injunction not to pray for it, is a strong testimony against the Popish doctrine of purgatory and prayers for the dead, which perhaps he may have had in his eye, for that was one of the errors that appeared in the church at a very early period. Though impenitence, in the case of any individual, should not be final, it effectually bars forgiveness while it continues; and we have no warrant to pray for the pardon of the sins of an unbeliever, or impenitent person, but in the way of his being first brought to faith and repentance. I hope W. D. will not take it amiss, that I recommend to him the serious consideration of these things. He may rest assured that he is more likely to profit by the contemplation of every sin, as deserving God's wrath and curse, than by endeavouring to impose upon the words of an inspired apostle, a meaning that would countenance the error, that some sins are so trifling as not to deserve punishment in the next, as well as in the present world.

I advised W. D. to return to the Church of Scotland, because, by his own account, he had left it under an erroneous impression of the doctrine held by that Church. I did not hold up the Church of Scotland as the only true church, or as the best of all possible churches, as Papists foolishly hold up theirs; but I maintain it as a principle of equity and common sense, that if a man leaves any church from a mistake with regard to any of its

principles, he ought to return and confess his mistake, as soon as it is pointed out to him, unless he had found a better, which, it is very evident W. D. has not done.

My correspondent, by an indefinite use of the word church, bewilders himself, as all other Papists do. They hold it as a first principle, that the universal church of Christ is a visible organized body; and that it must be under one visible head, such as the Pope. But nothing can be more unlike the pattern exhibited in the New Testament. When apostles speak of *the* church of Christ, in the singular number, they mean the whole company of believers, gathered together as one body in Christ, who is their only Head, Lord, and Lawgiver. In this sense, I admit that there can be only one true church; but then it is not a church exclusively on the earth; the greater part of it is in heaven. When the word church is used in reference to the associations of Christians in this world, so far from its being true that there can be only one true church on earth, there may be a thousand of them,—all true churches, and all living by faith in their divine Head, as separate members, but all belonging to the general body, and united to him of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. Thus we read, in the New Testament, of the church in Jerusalem, the church in Antioch, the seven churches in Asia, and the churches in Galatia, of which the number is not mentioned. It never occurred to inspired writers, when speaking of organized bodies of Christians, that there was only one true church in the world. This folly was reserved for the Pope of Rome and his blinded adherents in later times; and it is worthy of remark, that the apostle Paul, when addressing the Christians in Rome, does not call them a church. Addressing those in Corinth, once and again, he speaks to them in their collective capacity, as “the church of God which is at Corinth.” In like manner, several other churches are addressed; but his epistle to the Romans is addressed “to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints,” (chap. i. v. 7.) as if they had been so many unconnected individuals; and then, from the 16th chapter, we are led to infer that there were at least three churches in that city. In v. 3—5. speaking of Priscilla and Aquila, it is said, there was a church in their house. In the 14th verse salutations are sent to Asyncritus, and others, “and *the brethren which are with them* ;” and in the 15th verse, Philologus, and two or three more are mentioned, “and *all the saints which are with them* .” These small bodies of Christians, meeting in different places, perhaps compelled to meet in private houses, not being allowed greater publicity, would no doubt have a bond of union among themselves, so as to acknowledge, and have fellowship with one another, as they had opportunity; but it is a fact, that they are

nowhere in Scripture called the Church of Rome. Yet, without the shadow of a foundation in the New Testament, a monster has arisen under this title, boasting itself to be the only true church on earth, and the mother and mistress of all churches.

If I could get my correspondent to understand what a visible organized church is, he would see that it does not necessarily follow, from the circumstance of one church being right, that another must be wrong. Every church is in the right that holds the faith once delivered to the saints; and every church is wrong that corrupts or denies this faith, of which the church of Rome has been notoriously, and above all others, guilty, for fifteen hundred years: and as for differences in government, discipline, and forms of worship among Protestant churches, though it would be foolish to say they are all alike agreeable to the word of God, yet the difference between the most opposite extremes, is not equal in importance to many doctrinal differences in the Church of Rome. I admit, that it is "impossible that God should reveal one religion to one people, and a contrary one to another;" and when W. D. says that he hears this "very often from men of good education, and even from the pulpits," I must tell him, in plain English, that I do not believe it. Unless he is content to sit down under the odious imputation which this implies, he will tell me from what pulpits he heard such a sentiment expressed, and who were the speakers.

Though there is much to be deplored in the divisions which exist among Protestants, their separation into different communions is a proof of their honesty and sincerity; but the pretended union of doctrine in the Church of Rome proves her insincerity and falsehood. The former are so ingenuous and candid, that they cannot profess to be all of one mind, when they are not; hence their separation into different communities, each holding what they understand and believe to be the truth; in general, agreeing in the profession of those fundamental truths by which sinners are saved, and therefore acknowledged by one another as true churches; and differing chiefly with regard to government and modes of worship, which do not so affect the vitals of Christianity as to justify the members of one communion in withholding the appellation of Christian from another.

The Dominicans and Franciscans, the Jansenists and the Jesuits, and many others, were as directly opposed to one another, as any Protestant sects can possibly be, not on matters of form and discipline merely, but upon the most fundamental points of doctrine; yet the holy and infallible "Head of Catholic Unity," acknowledged them all as branches of his family, and bestowed upon them many extensive privileges. The Franciscans stoutly maintained that the Virgin Mary was born immaculate, while the



Dominicans asserted that she came into the world under original sin, though its effects were soon removed. Thus the two great parties were not agreed about the original character of one principal object of their worship; and by their quarrel, the peace of Europe was disturbed for many a day. In later times the Jesuits and the Dominicans had a furious contest, on the subjects of fate and free will; the latter "contending as stoutly, and at as great length in favour of God's eternal unconditional decrees, and the absence of all moral ability in the part of man, as the rankest predestinarian, at whose heresy" W. D. and other modern Papists "affect to sneer." Other subjects of dispute between the Jesuits and other orders were, "the extent of the jurisdiction and power of the Pope,—the Jesuits maintaining his infallibility, the others opposing it; the extent and prerogatives of the Church; the natural powers of man, and God's eternal decrees; the nature, efficacy, and necessity of divine grace; the doctrines of morality, and rules of practice," &c. See a well written pamphlet, just published, at Cork, entitled, *Six Letters to the Right Honourable Charles Grant, &c.* By SIMPLICIUS.

"Before I conclude," says this able writer, "this notice of the parties which have met and fought in the very bosom of that Church which alone possesses *unity*, I would slightly allude to the Jansenists, the most upright and useful body of its day as connected with Rome. Their contentions with the Jesuits, on the old topic of grace and free will, continued from 1642 to 1705. The press aided both parties, producing at one time, "The torch of St. Augustine," and at another, "Snuffers for St. Augustine's torch," and finally, "A gag for the Jansenists;" which gag, through the Jesuitical influence at Rome, was so effectually applied by the bull "unigenitus," as to effect the demolition of the most pure and practical body of Christians (notwithstanding some superstitions) that belonged to the Church of Rome, since it became Papal."

So much for the unity of the holy and infallible church. Different sects within its bosom teach the most opposite doctrines; and they hate one another with a perfect hatred. Nothing can exceed the abhorrence with which the Jesuits speak of Jansenists, to this very day, of which see an example in the *Orthodox Journal* for July, 1820. The Editor takes the part of the Jesuits; the more moderate and respectable of his brethren in England he calls Jansenists, and as such he abuses them, as if they were no better than the most detestable heretics.

THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CXII.

---

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 2d, 1820.

---

NOT being able to finish my remarks on W. D.'s letter in my last Number, I am obliged to continue the subject in the present one. The reader will have seen that my correspondent charges me pretty freely with lying, slander, and misrepresentation; and he thinks the Protestant religion must be in a miserable state, seeing its advocates have recourse to such means of defence. If it were worth while to retort upon this writer, it would be easy to show, that the accusations which he brings against Protestants, and against THE PROTESTANT in particular, more truly belong to himself and to his sect. In the very letter on which I am remarking, he misquotes my words, misrepresents my meaning, and falsely asserts that I had written a note to contradict a passage in the New Testament. (See the latter part of his letter, No. 110, and the first paragraph of No. 111.) This is a glaring instance of his being guilty of the very thing of which he accuses me; but he has not pointed out a single instance of the kind on my part. He admits that I have of late "quoted some of the principal Catholic works that are common among" them; but he does not say that I have misquoted a single word, or misrepresented the meaning of a single sentence. In his charges of slander, lying, and misrepresentation, he fixes upon nothing definite; he adduces no instance to support his general accusation, unless it be the story of purgatory bridge, which he calls a fable, as it really is, but I did not give it as a fact, but as a fable of priestly invention; and many such lies the priests have invented in order to raise money. The story of the bridge is not more absurd and ridiculous than the fable of purgatory itself, which, no doubt, W. D. believes with all his heart; and doing this, he ought to have no difficulty in swallowing the story of the bridge.

I cannot but reflect with great satisfaction on such a communication from such a correspondent. He has been searching every

page of my two volumes, with the eye and the mind of an adversary, in order to find something against me, and he has discovered nothing that he can refer to, as an example of departure from the straight rule of truth and sincerity; and therefore he has recourse to a mere general charge of the venomous spirit with which I treat his religion, and the thousands of other ridiculous nonsense with which I amuse my readers. I could desire no greater testimony in my favour, than the silence of an adversary as to any specific charge, while his hostility leads him to deal in general and undefined accusations.

He has read many a plain and scriptural exposure of the errors of his church, on the subjects of transubstantiation, sacrifice of the mass, auricular confession, purgatory, &c., and to all this he does not reply a single word. His holy mother must sit down under all the accusations which I have brought against her; and he has nothing to say in her behalf; except to assail her antagonist with scolding and hard words; and to assert that he has not yet seen any proof that she is in error in any one point of faith. It would have been more to the purpose, had he attempted to show that the things which I have exposed are not errors, but truths founded upon the divine word. This he has not thought proper to do; and it may be presumed, that few beside himself will be satisfied with his bare assertion, that he has not yet seen what any man who does not shut his eyes may see.

W. D. seems, at first view, to be in earnest when he requests my advice, which church to adopt as his guide, in which he may serve his Maker here on earth, as the most certain foundation, and likewise my reasons for advising him to follow one more than another. I have already advised him to return to the Church of Scotland, and have given my reason for doing so; but it seems very evident from the tenor of his letter, that he does not really want any advice on the subject. He has made up his mind already. He not only has not seen any proof that his church is in error, but he tells us plainly that he does not expect to see it. He has shut his eyes, and he is determined to keep them shut. He has adopted that fundamental principle of Popery, "I believe as the church believes." This leaves no room for inquiry, or the exercise of private judgment. W. D. therefore, cannot be really in earnest in asking advice, what church to adopt as his guide, seeing he has already adopted an infallible one. But he would gladly get me to engage in a discussion of the merits and demerits of different Protestant churches; and thus draw me away from the weekly exposure of the deformity of that of Rome, which it appears he can neither defend nor conceal. He has thrown out a bait, once and again, to hook me away from my purpose. In his first letter, by an attack upon the Shorter Catechism;



and in his second, by extracts, real or pretended, from the works of Luther, he throws out a sort of challenge to engage in a discussion of the doctrine of the divine decrees, which I am sure is beyond both his depth and mine; and is, I suppose, chosen by him on this very account, knowing that if we were to begin, we would "find no end, in wandering mazes lost."

But whether he be really desirous of advice or not, I shall take the liberty of telling him, and my other readers of his communion, that they ought not to adopt any church as their *guide*. Every Christian church itself is subject to a guide that is above it. This is the word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, which is the only infallible guide of churches collectively, and of Christians individually; and I request them to consider farther, that it will be of little avail for persons to belong to any church, unless they belong to the Saviour, and be united to him as his members, which is the blessed condition of all who believe his gospel and submit to his authority, and of no others, though they should belong to the purest church in the world. To belong to Christ, in the sense of being his members, it is necessary to accept of salvation, as the gift of free grace, upon the footing of his righteousness alone, to the entire exclusion of self-righteousness, as well as the merits of any saint, or of all the saints put together. To belong to Christ, it is also necessary to be born again by the influence of the Holy Spirit, to become a new creature, and to live a new life; that is, a life of devotion and obedience to the will of God.

To such submission to the righteousness of God, and such obedience to the will of God, the principal Protestant churches present no obstruction; at least, nothing to hinder any individual from living by faith in Christ alone as his Saviour and Intercessor, and from practising all the duties of a holy life. Some churches may afford greater helps than others for promoting a life of faith and obedience; but I know of none that holds the true Protestant faith, in which a Christian would be authoritatively prevented from living the life of a Christian. But it is otherwise in the Church of Rome. The errors which she teaches by authority, strike at the root of the true faith and of holy practice. It is impossible for a member of this church to profess the faith of the gospel in its divine simplicity and purity, without incurring the punishment of heresy. Yet to profess the faith of Christ, is as really a duty binding upon a Christian as to believe in him. "As with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, so with the mouth confession is made to salvation," Rom. x. 10. Now suppose a member of the Church of Rome to confess Christ, and say that he trusts in him alone for salvation from first to last, without regard to his own works and deservings; that he has not, and never can have any merit to plead in the sight of God; and that all the

merit of the saints in heaven could not serve the purpose of his salvation, or contribute to it in the smallest degree, he would be in danger, if within reach of the Inquisition, of being burnt to death for his heresy. Thus the very first principle of the Christian life meets with positive, powerful obstruction in the Church of Rome; and the confession of the truth, which is the first duty of one who believes it, is authoritatively interdicted.

Should a man set his heart to worship God alone, in the name of the *one* Mediator, he would meet with a thousand obstacles in the Church of Rome. The priests would be incessantly thrusting themselves between him and the object of his worship, and diverting his mind from every devout contemplation. Should he express gratitude to God for the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit, the priest would command him to think of the virtues of his holy water. Should he confide in the intercession of Christ in heaven, as sufficient to maintain his cause before God, the priest would command him, under pain of *anathema*, to apply to the Virgin Mary, and fifty other intercessors, before he should venture to go to the Saviour himself. Should he express humble confidence in approaching the throne of divine mercy, with confession of his sins, and the hope of forgiveness, the priest would let him know, that he must confess his sins to him, and look to him for absolution. Should he endeavour to regulate his life according to the precepts of the divine law, his ghostly guide, would enjoin upon him a course of austerities, and pilgrimages, and fastings, on certain days of the week, and at certain times of the year, for which there is no precept in the word of God, but attention to which would effectually divert his mind from the divine commandments. And if he should think of worshipping God as a Spirit, in spirit and in truth, he would be distracted by the exhibition of images of Christ, and of the Virgin Mary, and other saints, presented as helps to his devotion, though he knew them to be no better than vain idols.

I shall make one other supposition, which might be realized at any time in the Church of Rome. Suppose one of her members, deeply affected by Christ's sufferings and death, and professing to view this as a complete atonement for sin, should express his gratitude to God for this all-perfect sacrifice, and his confidence in that Saviour, whom the heavens have received, whom therefore he does not see with his bodily eyes, or expect ever to see in this world, agreeably to the words of the apostle Peter, "whom having not seen ye love, in whom though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory;"—Suppose, I say, one making these professions, and about to express his gratitude to God accordingly, a priest steps forward, and tells him that there was nothing particular in the sufferings and death

of Christ, but what he exhibits every day in the sacrifice of the mass; and that he is mistaken in supposing that Christ is not now to be seen in this world, for he takes out of a box a consecrated wafer, and assures him that that is the very Christ that was born of the Virgin, that was crucified, rose from the dead, and sat down at the right hand of God. Who, on receiving such information from his priest, whom he is taught to consider his divinely appointed instructor in the faith, would not feel his devotion effectually marred, by such a representation of Christ and his atoning sacrifice? Yet, without the least exaggeration, this is the true import of what the Church of Rome teaches; and a genuine Papist will give up every article of divine revelation, sooner than he will part with the dogma, that the consecrated wafer is the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; and that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Where this is constantly maintained, as it is in the Church of Rome, there must be an insurmountable obstacle to every act of divine worship, that can be called a reasonable service.

W. D. expresses a wish to be informed in what church he may serve his Maker here on earth, as the most certain foundation. From what I have said above, I hope every enlightened reader will perceive, whether W. D. does so or not, that he cannot serve his Maker in the Church of Rome; that supposing him to receive the truth of the gospel in purity, he would not be permitted to honour his Maker by publicly professing it; because that church has authoritatively condemned the gospel of the grace of God, which brings salvation to the guilty, solely upon the footing of Christ's perfect obedience and atoning sacrifice; has set up the merits of saints and the mass sacrifice to be trusted in; has commanded all her members, under pain of anathema, to regard the mass as the very sacrifice of Christ, and to believe that the bread and wine in the mass are the very Christ himself, and to worship them as such. Obedience to the Church of Rome, in this article alone, is absolutely incompatible with that undivided worship which the Almighty claims for himself, and with that trust in Christ alone for salvation, without which no sinner can serve his Maker here on earth, or hope for happiness in the world to come. Whether, therefore, other churches serve God or not, I tell my correspondent plainly, it is impossible for him to serve his Maker in the Church of Rome, without renouncing her fundamental doctrines, which would virtually be renouncing the church, and becoming Protestant.

The sum of the matter is this:—The Church of Rome establishes iniquity by law. She makes it imperative upon her members to believe error, and to practise idolatry. To obey her is to disobey God. Protestant churches condemn such blasphemous tenets, and such idolatrous practices. They make it imperative upon no man to believe error, or to worship a creature, but recommend



the word of God to all. In them, therefore, men may serve their Maker; in the Church of Rome they cannot. I shall be told again, that Papists disavow all idolatry, and that they curse all idol worshippers; but they do not deny the fact, that they render divine worship to the consecrated host, which every man who trusts his senses knows to be nothing but a bit of bread. I must therefore repeat my reply to the often repeated disavowal; if this be not idolatry, there never was such a thing in the world, and the words "idol worshipper" have no meaning.

I am afraid my readers will think I have wasted more time and paper in my reply to W. D. than his letter is entitled to; and indeed I have gone beyond what I at first intended; but as it is my wish to meet fully and fairly every objection to the Protestant religion, that is of any importance, or that has a plausible appearance, I could not avoid going into detail upon some points on which Papists lay great stress, and by which they attempt to justify their obstinate adherence to such an antichristian communion. In order to set the matter as broadly before their eyes as possible, I have made some repetitions, which the intelligent reader will excuse, for the sake of those who require line upon line.

I shall conclude the present Number with an extract from the Life of our countryman, Mr. Craig, who was some time colleague of John Knox in the ministry, in Edinburgh, which will illustrate what I have said in this Number with regard to the impossibility of making a profession of the truth, and serving God in the Church of Rome. I quote from the Christian Instructor, for July 1811.

Mr. Craig, in early life, had some scruples about certain articles of the Romish faith, which made him suspected of heresy; but these were removed by conversation with the famous Cardinal Pole, who was one of the most popular Romish ecclesiastics of the day. Mr. Craig, captivated by his affability, and admiring him for his learning and good moral conduct, so entirely yielded himself to his arguments and instructions, that he became, in his own opinion, and in the opinion of all others, a confirmed Papist. He was a friar of the order of St. Dominick. He was recommended by the Cardinal to the convent of that order in Bononia, (now Bologna) where he so distinguished himself, that he was appointed Rector of the Great School in that city, by which he became connected with the University, which was then one of the most considerable in Europe.

"Being one day, in the year 1557, turning over some books in the library of the Inquisition, he observed amongst them a copy of Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion. He never had read that book, though the first edition of it was printed in the year 1536. Perhaps he had hitherto been afraid to read it, lest it should revive in his mind those scruples from which he had been relieved by Cardinal Pole. But his curiosity now prompted him to look into it, perhaps thinking that he was so well

established in the Popish religion, as to be secure against any change. He first noticed that the diction was elegant Latin. This attracted him to read some parts, and these he found so interesting, that he resolved to take home the book, and to give the whole of it a serious perusal. Every paragraph, as he went on in his reading, and compared it with the sacred Scriptures, flashed conviction on his mind. He beheld the errors of the Church of Rome exposed, and the sure grounds pointed out, on which the doctrines of the Reformers were founded. It is sufficient to say, that, by the time he had finished his serious reading, he was become, through the blessing of God, a sincere and well enlightened convert from Popery.

“But he was presently at a loss how to regulate his after conduct, so as to satisfy his conscience on the one hand, and on the other to avoid the danger of persecution. He knew no Protestant in Bononia to whom he could open his mind. But there was an old friar, with whom he had loved to converse, and who was greatly respected for his sanctity, and his humble behaviour. In this good man, he thought he could place some confidence. He therefore engaged him in a long and serious conversation, in the course of which the doctrines of the Reformers were mentioned. But Mr. Craig spoke of them so favourably, and with so much feeling, that the friar immediately suspected he had changed his principles, and charged him with it. He could not deny the charge; and then, to his utter astonishment, the friar, instead of upbraiding him, said, “Brother, it is now many years since I embraced these opinions, but *I have kept the belief of them secret in my own breast; and my advice to you is to do the same, for you know that the times are perilous.*” If Mr. Craig had followed the advice given him by the old man, he would have avoided the persecution which he afterwards met with. But he was a sincere and zealous convert, and felt a strong desire that others should be brought as he had been, to the knowledge of the truth.

“Mr Row, in his manuscript history, which was written a long time before the publication of Spottiswood’s History, tells us, that the following words of our blessed Saviour were powerful in Mr. Craig’s mind, (Matt. x. 32, 33.) “Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven; and whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven.” He understood these words in a more extensive meaning than the friar seems to have done. He considered them as connected with a similar declaration, (Mark viii. 38.) “Whoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels.” He therefore thought himself bound, not only to profess himself a Christian in general, but also, to whatever danger he might thereby be exposed, explicitly to confess,

and to assert in his character of a public teacher, every doctrine and precept, which he believed to be contained in the gospel of our Saviour. He urged his new principles in his conferences with the friars, and seems also to have stated them favourably in his sermons. The Romish zealots in the convent were highly offended. They failed in bringing him back to his former persuasion; and at last loudly complained of him as an obstinate heretic. He was thereupon seized and cast into prison. But as he had many friends in Bononia who loved him, it was thought most expedient that he should be sent to the Inquisition at Rome, where he would meet with a more impartial judgment. Accordingly, Nov. 18th, 1558, he was conveyed as a prisoner to Rome; and Archbishop Spottiswood tells us, that at Rome he lay in great misery, in the prison of the Inquisition, nine months. In all the rigorous examinations to which he was subjected, he was enabled to be constant in his profession. At last, August 18th, 1559, he was brought before his judges, to hear sentence pronounced upon him. The sentence was, that the next day, viz. August 19th, he should be publicly burnt as a heretic. Mr Row informs us that there were some other persons condemned to suffer along with him.

“While he and his companions, expecting to be executed the next day, were spending the night in prayer, in godly conference, and in singing of psalms, the door of the prison was suddenly opened, and a man whom they did not know, entered, and told them that they were free. They were astonished, and at first dreaded that some snare was laid to increase their sufferings. But the man told them that the Pope had died that night, and that all the prisons in Rome were laid open. It was indeed the case, for Paul IV. had died that night. Mr. Row says, it was customary at the death of a Pope, to liberate all prisoners. Such as were confined for debt were not recalled; but such as had been guilty of heresy, or of offences committed against the church, were quickly pursued, and forcibly brought back.”

Mr. Craig, however, escaped, and by a series of singular interpositions of Providence, he at last got safe to his native country; and though not an originator, he was singularly useful in helping forward the happy Reformation, of which we at this day are enjoying the benefit. Not to speak of the crown of righteousness which such a faithful servant of Christ, and a martyr in purpose, though saved from a violent death, is now honoured to wear, how noble does he appear even in the esteem of his fellow men, in comparison with the poor cowardly friar, who, though convinced of the truth, was afraid to confess it, and who had not the courage “to serve his Maker here on earth!”



THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CXIII.

---

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 9th, 1820.

---

I FEEL strongly inclined to favour my readers with one or two Numbers more of light and miscellaneous reading, before I enter upon the discussion of any of the more grave subjects which I have proposed for consideration. I did not know till of late, that a smart controversy took place about a dozen of years ago, in the north of England, in consequence of a charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Durham, by the truly venerable bishop of that see, entitled "The grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome." This charge, though intended chiefly for the instruction and warning of the clergy under his lordship's immediate inspection, happened to touch upon some points, on which Papists always feel extremely sore. Some of them, priests I presume, from their pedantic show of learning, began to attack, or rather to nibble, at this said charge, though it does not appear that they could have any higher object in view, than the little fame that they hoped to acquire among their fellow Papists, by entering the lists with a person of his lordship's rank and character. Their puny efforts to commend the Popish, and malign the Protestant faith, were powerfully opposed by different writers, whose names are not given. The pieces on both sides were collected, and they form two neat volumes.

In one of the Protestant pieces, I find the following very striking observations, which are given as the words of a divine of the Church of England, of a former century. "The grand enemy of mankind hath, by various ways and means, all along, contrived and endeavoured to defeat the designs of heaven for the good and happiness of men; and, as the divine wisdom hath, in several ages of the world, manifested itself for the encouraging and promoting of true righteousness and holiness; so hath the devil always been at work, to bring forward, in opposition, what he could find most proper, for the hindering of the good effects of God's kindness towards us. When the fulness of time came, by the appearance of the Son of God in the world, he was, in a great measure;

dethroned ; his kingdom was overthrown ; and the last and most effectual means were used, for the recovery of men out of his snare and power. When, therefore, he perceived, that, by all the grievous persecutions he raised against the church, it spread only so much the faster ; that, at last, the whole heathen world fell down before the cross of Christ ; when he was expelled with shame out of his temples, and from his altars, when his oracles were silenced, and the religion of Jesus prevailed every where ;—he then betook himself to his old serpentine arts of dissimulation. Since he could no longer oppose Christ's kingdom by open war, he resolved to *turn Christian*, and to set up for Christ's *deputy* and *substitute* here on earth ; to fight against Christianity under Christ's banner ; and by adulterating and corrupting the Christian doctrine, to spoil it of all its efficacy ; and to introduce his old heathen rites, and idolatrous ceremonies, as unwritten traditions from Christ himself, or his Apostles ;—and so under *his* name, and pretended authority, to exercise all that cruelty, oppression, and fraud, which is so pleasant to his own infernal nature ; hoping to burn, destroy, and root out, all true Christians from the face of the earth, under colour of propagating the Catholic faith, and enlarging Christ's kingdom in the world.

“ When Christendom had long groaned under this miserable tyranny, it pleased God, in many places of Europe, but especially here in England, to set on foot a *Reformation* of religion ; which was happily and peaceably accomplished among us, by the favour and countenance of public authority, and the wise counsel and advice of our reverend bishops and other ministers. To nip this in the bud, the devil raised that sharp persecution in Queen Mary's days, in which our first Reformers gloriously sealed what they had done with their blood. But this proving ineffectual, that he might the better frustrate the ends of our Reformation, *himself would turn Reformer too.*”

The author proceeds to show how the devil effected his purpose, by exciting the extravagance of certain sects in England ; but his diabolical efforts were not confined to that kingdom. They were at least equally successful in other places, especially on the continent, and almost under the eye of the great German Reformer, where certain zealots did more injury to the cause of reformation, by their ridiculous caricature of it, than the Pope, with all his army of priests was able to do. This, as our author justly observes, ~~was~~ the work of the devil in his new character of a Reformer.

For centuries before the Reformation, and ever since, till within these few years, the devil found means to keep the great part of what is called Christendom, in gross ignorance. He succeeded so far, as to establish it as a maxim, that “ ignorance is the mother of devotion ;” and his blinded adherents, I mean the devoted vassals of the Pope of Rome, never seem to have thought, that education

would be of any use to the common people. They rather considered it as a dangerous thing; and used every effort in their power to prevent them from acquiring any more knowledge of religion, than they themselves were pleased to communicate. Of late years, however, the subject of extending the benefits of education has occupied so much of the public attention; it has appeared to all classes of the community, a matter of so much importance to teach the poor the art of reading; and the establishment of schools for the purpose, particularly in Ireland, has received so much public support, and has in fact become so popular, that it would not do to appear to oppose the work of education any longer. The devil, therefore, must now have recourse to some other shift; and as of old he professed to become Christian, with the view of destroying Christianity; and Reformer, with the view of discrediting the Reformation, so now, in order to obstruct the work of education, he has determined to become *Schoolmaster*.

The fact of this is clearly proved, by the noise that the Pope of Rome, and the popish Archbishop of Tuam, have lately made about the establishment of schools, in order to instruct the *innocent* youth of their communion. There was not a whisper of any thing of the kind, while the people of Ireland were sitting in gross darkness, and while no effort was made to impart to them the light of knowledge. But since the establishment of the Hibernian and other Societies; and since it became very probable that all the youth in Ireland would soon be taught to read the word of God, then the Pope and his ghostly agents, appear like men awaked out of sleep; they are all at once upon the alert; they will have schools of their own; and they are determined that the youth of their communion shall not be allowed to acquire the art of reading from any but teachers of their own appointment, and of their own faith.

Some persons may suppose, that this is nothing but a commendable emulation, excited by their Protestant neighbours; and a tacit acknowledgment that they have been guilty of culpable inattention to the education of their people; but it is in fact neither the one nor the other. The "cloven foot" is not so artfully concealed as it has often been in other cases; for the education commanded by the Pope, and provided by his clergy for the poor in Ireland, is avowedly such an education as shall exclude the reading of the word of God, and withdraw the children from the schools in which they are in danger of being taught to read it: and whatever sort of men the priests may appoint to superintend such schools, I have no hesitation in putting them on a footing with other inventions of the devil, intended to oppose the truth, and to perpetuate error.

It appears from the Reports of different societies, that many of the schools in Ireland are disturbed, from time to time, by the im-



pertinent interference of popish priests, who insult the teachers, and terrify the children, and even drive out of the school such as they conceive to belong to their communion. I shall give here a recent instance of this, with a most reverend archbishop's approbation of the fact; and then I shall show what sort of education the priests have prepared for the poor children, of whom they claim the exclusive oversight.

*Letter from the Secretaries of the Dublin Sunday School Union, to the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.*

“MY LORD,                      No. 16, Upper Sackville-street, 7th September, 1819.

“It is with very great pain we feel ourselves obliged to call your Lordship's attention to a transaction which occurred on Sunday the 2nd ulto.—the circumstances attending which are shortly as follows:

“One of the objects aimed at by the Society of which we have the honour of being Secretaries, is to establish Sunday Schools throughout the city, in such situations as may seem to be most in need of them; and among other similar institutions, our Committee were enabled, by the kindness of friends, to begin a small Sunday School on the 28th of March last, in Sampson's lane, off Moore street. Since that period this school has been carried on with considerable diligence, and with some prospect of success; the only endeavour of the teachers being to make their pupils able to read the Sacred Scriptures, and to understand the meaning of what they read. But on the day already mentioned, the Rev. Mr. Salmon, of Liffey-street Chapel, entered the School, took the books from the hands of several of the children, and in an authoritative manner, ordered all that were Catholics peremptorily to leave the place; he in effect forcibly turned the children out of the School, and accompanied his conduct with such observations, as showed, that his hostility to such institutions was of the most decided description.

“Convinced, as we all are, of the feelings that such a procedure must excite, not only in the breast of your lordship, but of every well wisher to the good morals and peace of society; we consider it an imperative duty laid upon us, to state to you the occurrence explicitly as it happened. We are constrained to do so, not only from the circumstance of its affording your lordship an opportunity of expressing your sentiments on the subject; but, as the gentleman of whom we complain, stated that he was a curate in your lordship's diocese, and that he was determined in future to oppose all Sunday Schools. For himself, we can only regret the mistaken views which could lead him to such a determination; but for our own sakes, we have most respectfully to solicit, that

your lordship will take such precautionary measures, as will prevent him on any future occasion, from molesting our Schools.

It will always be with extreme reluctance that our Committee will appeal to the constituted authorities of the country for protection, but if the restraints of professional character, of civil decorum, or of superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction, should be found insufficient to hinder this individual, or any other, from rudely disturbing these peaceful seminaries of knowledge, which we have under our care, your lordship must perceive that such an appeal is unavoidable.

Our Committee will hold a meeting at No. 16, Upper Sackville-street, on Tuesday evening next, the 14th instant, for the purpose of receiving your lordship's answer on the subject, and in the mean time, we are, with great respect,

My Lord,

Your lordship's very obedient and humble servants.

Most Rev. Dr. Troy, (Signed,) W. SMITH, JUN. } Secs.  
&c. &c. M. POLLOCK, }

*P. S.* In addition to the above, it should also be stated, that the attendance of the children was perfectly free and voluntary, not only on their own part, but that of their parents; as may be confirmed by their parents' declarations, both before this transaction and since. Indeed, many of the children were specially given in charge to the teachers, by their parents and other guardians. No enquiry as to particular religious profession was ever made by the teachers; nor, until the Rev. Mr. Salmon divided the School in the unpleasant manner we mention, did they know to what distinctive communion their scholars belonged.

(Signed.)

W. S. JUN.

M. P.

*Letter from the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, to the Secretaries of the Sunday School Union.*

GENTLEMEN,

3, Cavendish-row, Dublin, 13th September, 1819.

The Catholic Church sanctions no other English version of the Sacred Scriptures but the Doway edition, translated from the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome, in the fourth century; and which, when accompanied with appropriate notes and comments, is permitted to be read by the learned and the lettered: she does not, however, approve of the Holy Bible being degraded to the level of a common school book, or capriciously explained by unauthorized commentators. Histories of the Bible, historical and moral extracts from it, and Catechisms, are generally used in Catholic schools.

The present learned bishops of Lincoln and Peterborough, and other eminent divines of the Established Church in England and Ireland, have proved the inexpediency and danger to religion,

from reading the Bible without note or comment; and of submitting it to the interpretation of every reader's private judgment, which experience has proved to be a prolific hive, from which have issued countless swarms of sectaries, distracting Christendom, each clamorously appealing to the Bible, the Bible, and however disunited amongst themselves, all arrayed in hostility to the Catholic Parent Church, which they most uncharitably continue to misrepresent and calumniate. Christianity was preached before the gospels were written and published; were the Bible alone sufficient for the knowledge of religion, the ministry of the word would be superfluous and the sacred ministry itself rendered useless.

The Catholic Church does therefore prohibit the youth of her communion to frequent schools in these kingdoms, where a different version of the Scriptures from that of Doway is used, or where unauthorized persons assume a right to expound the divine oracles; in which saint Peter says in his 2nd Epistle, *That there are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own perdition, and that no prophesy of the Scripture is made by private interpretation.*

Conformably, therefore, to those maxims, and to the uniform discipline of the Catholic Church, Rev. Mr. Salmon, went to your School, to withdraw the Catholic children from it, at the very time when religious and moral instructions were given—particularly to children, in Liffey-street parish Chapel, he cannot on this account be justly accused of opposition to the constituted authorities, which allow the free exercise of the Catholic religion, and the authority of its ministers to instruct the ignorant of their communion.

Protestants and Catholics may zealously concur in promoting a general education of the poor, and still maintain the faith and discipline of their respective churches. If this be not permitted, no system of general education can succeed; why then are Catholic poor children invited to schools where their catechism is not taught, and a prohibited version of the Bible without note or comment is used, and explained by incompetent unauthorized persons?

As to the particular conduct of Rev. Mr. Salmon, I should be sorry indeed that he would act on any occasion in a manner unbecoming the meekness of a clergyman, or the manners of a gentleman. I this moment receive his inclosed explanatory letter, and have the honour to be with great respect, and in the spirit of perfect charity,

Gentlemen,

Your very humble servant,

Wm. Smith, Jun. & M. Pollock. (Signed,) J. T. TROY.  
Esqrs. &c &c.



I shall now proceed to show what sort of an education it is which the priests have provided for the youth of their communion, whom they are now willing to instruct in the art of reading. Archbishop Troy says, that "Histories of the Bible, historical and moral extracts from it, and Catechisms, are generally used in Catholic schools." Now, I happen to have in my possession a great number of these catechisms, and also some of their histories of the Bible, with historical and moral extracts from it, and I do not hesitate to say, that all of them are just what we might expect from the devil, professing to be Christian. The Christian vocabulary is used to a certain extent; language that savours of the love of God is introduced; but the tendency of the whole is to alienate the mind from the knowledge of God as he is revealed to us in the scriptures, and to lead the deluded worshipper to dependance on himself, or on some other creature.

I shall, at present, confine myself to the celebrated school book, edited by W. E. Andrews, which Dr. Milner, Vicar Apostolic of the midland district, England, declares to be "the most complete and valuable work of its kind in our language, and eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public;" and the right reverend prelate, promises to recommend it in those places of education over which he has any authority or influence. Nay, as I showed in my first volume, this work is praised by a correspondent of the author, as a much better book than the Bible, because, from it one will acquire a better knowledge of religion at one reading, than he will learn from the Bible in a whole life. I shall now favour the reader with a sample of the doctrine which is taught by this, which some of our English Papists consider, the best of all books.

"The souls of some, who have not been very good during their life-time, and yet have had pardon of their sins, will go into a prison, called purgatory, for a while;" page 67, 4th ed. The reader will observe, that the pardon of their sins here spoken of, is that which a priest can grant for money; and having obtained this, they need not be very anxious about the future, though they have not been very good persons; as they will only go to prison "for a while."

To a child, the author thus addresses himself. "By Baptism which you have received, you are washed from original sin, by the application of the merits of the blood of Jesus Christ; delivered from the universal curse of mankind incurred by sin, and freed from the power of the devil. You have been made a child of God; the disciple of Jesus Christ our Saviour. You have acquired God for your father, Jesus Christ for your master, your instructor, your example, and for the rule of your life; the holy church for your mother and guardian; the angels for your protec-

tors, the saints for your intercessors. You have been made the temple of God, who dwells in you by his grace. The heir of his eternal kingdom, from the title and hope of which you were fallen for ever; and you are brought back into the secure way that leads to it, being made a member of Jesus Christ and his church, out of which all those who obstinately remain cannot be saved, and wherein you are now illuminated with the light of the faith of Jesus Christ, instructed by his doctrine, nourished by his precious body and blood, assisted by his grace, and furnished with all the necessary means for your salvation." page 116. All these blessed things are said to belong to the young Papist, not as having received the holy Spirit, for in that case the statement would be partly true, but merely because he has received a sprinkling of holy water from the hand of a priest. I do not know any thing that can have a more pernicious effect upon the youthful mind than this.

In perfect consistence with the well known character of Popery, this best of all school books, teaches, page 177, that a lie is not a mortal sin, when it is not in a matter of consequence. It is admitted, indeed, that "a lie is always a sin, because it is always against the truth, known to be such by him that speaks;" and that "the habit of lying, although lightly, is not a light thing, nor of small consequence." There is here an attempt to guard the error, because it would not be creditable to teach the venial nature of a lie without some such qualifying expressions; but when it is plainly taught that a lie in any sense is not a mortal sin, every Christian must hold it as a doctrine of the devil, who was a liar from the beginning, and who, since he has become schoolmaster, will, no doubt, endeavour to persuade the Popish youth to believe in the purity of his own character, and the innocence of his own practice.

In the account which this writer gives of the feasts and fasts of the church, there is such a mass of superstition and will-worship, that it is impossible for a person to perceive any traces of real Christianity. The virgin Mary and the saints appear to be every thing; and the Saviour, in comparison, appears as nothing. The virgin Mary is declared to be "the Mother of purity itself;" and speaking of her child-birth, when she brought forth Jesus, it is called that "to which, out of her great *humility*, she submitted."

Such is the instruction provided for our Popish youth, in what is called by a bishop of their church, the most valuable work of its kind in our language. I appeal now to the Christian reader, whether I have not made good the assertion with which I set out, that the devil himself has become schoolmaster.

THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CXIV.

---

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16th, 1820.

---

IN consequence of the very extensive circulation of my Work in Ireland, I have lately acquired some more valuable correspondents belonging to that country; and from them a great deal of information, which will be interesting to my readers. Without farther preface, I shall proceed to give the substance of a letter which I received about two months ago.

“SIR,

“I HAVE just read, with much pleasure and interest, your first volume of *THE PROTESTANT*. It only came into my hands last week, or I should have communicated with you sooner. I have long desired to see such a publication as yours, and I trust it will get into circulation in this benighted country.—I could not read your publication without desiring to give you any information that I think may be useful to you in conducting a Work that is calculated to excite so much attention. My first communication shall be to give you a fuller account of Dr. Lanigan’s business than you seem to possess; (See vol. I. page 226, Glasgow edition, in which this reverend Doctor is introduced as giving five reasons why a promise may be broken,) as it is one of the extraordinary instances of the character of modern Popery, where it has power, that it discovers the high sense of the rights of honour, conscience and citizenship, for which *Vindicator* would make it stand remarkable. I must preface my story, in order to give it to you at large.

“In the beginning of 1808, there appeared an infamous paragraph in one of the Dublin papers, saying, that Mr. R. of Kilkenny, preached a violent Orange sermon in the church there, on the Sunday preceding; and some strong expressions were quoted, as if used by him. It was a day on which some soldiers of an Orange lodge went to church in some procession, which made Mr. R. preach a sermon determinately opposite to what was said in the paragraph, in which he besought the congregation to



live, as far as possible, at peace with all men. Mr. R. got his attorney to write to the printer, to say that he purposed to prosecute him for the libel. The printer gave up a priest of that town, as the writer of the paragraph. Mr. R. consulted with a friend on the occasion, wishing to preserve peace as much as he could. It was agreed that this friend should call on the priest, inform him that they had his letter, ask him to make a private apology, and contradict, by another anonymous paragraph, what he had written on the ground of misinformation. He accordingly went with another friend, spoke to him as mildly as he could, and mentioned the only thing he required. He listened with surprise for some time, without answering, affected great astonishment at such a charge, and denied it flatly. When told that the information was positive, he dropt down on one knee, put his hand to his heart, and protested before God, by his priesthood, and by the mass which he had just celebrated, that he never sent such a paragraph to the printer. Greatly shocked by such a mode of asseveration, the gentleman who was in possession of the letter, produced it, and left him to read it. He went from him to Dr. Lanigan, his bishop, for he was one of Lanigan's curates, mentioned to him the circumstance, without fully repeating his protest, but told him that he had made a solemn appeal to heaven. Dr. Lanigan *seemed* very indignant; said in a pompous way, that he would not suffer such a man to remain longer in the town than it was possible to get him removed, and that he would show him his displeasure in a most marked manner. In a little time he did remove him, but it was from a curacy of £25 a year, with scarce any perquisites, to a situation in the country of five times the value. So much for Popish honour and conscience. Jesuitism need not be revived by a Bull, or by colleges; it exists in full power and action.

“Immediately after this, Dr. Milner, having said and unsaid to Mr. Ponsonby on the veto business; having published and contradicted, and published and contradicted again; found it necessary not to commit himself any more by writing, but come over to Ireland, to stop, by personal communication with the bishops, &c. the growing inclination to grant the veto. Already the primate and his diocese, by public resolutions, had granted it. This diocese was proceeding to follow him, the resolutions were drawn up, which Dr. Lanigan promised to sign. Dr. Milner had the same week invited a number of bishops or legates to meet him at Cork, at the consecration of a splendid new chapel, which was an excellent opportunity and excuse for meeting. After all the abominations of the consecration which lasted several hours, with all the forms, charms, and spells, by which superstition is fascinated and fed, they had a private convocation. Dr. Milner de-

clared his abhorrence of the intended concession, which originated with himself, and was kept up as long as he thought it could impose ; but now it must be put down by all means. The bishops and legates hastened home ; all their agents were set at work ; and immediately that which was ready to be cheerfully granted, was denounced as a greater abomination than the penal laws in the fullest letter of the old statutes. Milner set off to Kilkenny. Dr. Lanigan, who was not at Cork, had his eyes opened immediately, as if by the very clergy and inhabitants that one week before publicly voted for the resolutions, and ordered them to be prepared for signature : so quickly does darkness become light ; and light darkness in popish minds ! The two chairmen of the meeting were independent men, Major B. a man of large fortune, the other Mr. L. a Banker in the town. These men refused to retract their signature ; and Major B. hurt at Dr. Lanigan's message, put in the advertisement which provoked the five reasons for breaking a promise, and they required all the reasons of all the angelic doctors of the calendar. The bishop was determined to punish the chairmen and oblige them to retract. The priest already mentioned, had proved himself a fit instrument for such work. He went round the country, sent in the farmers to run upon, and break L's Bank, they came in thousands, the Protestant noblemen and gentlemen of the country came forward to assist L. brought in their national paper, published an advertisement to say that they would take his notes for all rents, &c. and threatening tenants who should join in such a conspiracy ; but Popery in this country is not so easily overcome. The people crowded in,—they threatened the Banker's life, to consume his houses, destroy his cattle, and had actually houghed some of them. He held out for a week ;—at length terrified, he sent one of the most respectable gentlemen of the place to the bishop, with his written recantation ; craved pardon for his offence in daring to follow his conscience in opposition to a bishop's mandate, and requested the bishop to come and disperse the mob. The bishop came, and before the city, standing in a place where he could be seen, he raised his hand, and simply said, " My friends begone," and the people instantly went off with a shout ; and in the evening had an immense bonfire to celebrate the triumph of Popery over all the rights of conscience, citizenship, and protection of a British subject.

"The triumph did not end here. Major B. still was obstinate. His military pride would not allow him to yield so soon. But he must be subdued. While such a Mordecai was at the gate, the power of the bishop would not be supreme. The same priest was set to work. He denounced the Major under the name of a fox, whom he called the people to hunt out of the country.

The Major made great threats;—said he would go and live in England, and rear his children Protestants; but he knew not the power of the spells of Popery. They are not to be broken by the resolutions of pride. The priest created such a spirit against him in the country, that he, at length, getting terrified, or rather overpowered by superstition, yielded; and, in order to reconcile himself, appointed with a farmer, who had a daughter about to be married, to ask him to the wedding, that he might meet the priest, and make friends. He did so: the Major met him, and they were reconciled. The Major has been since the champion of antivetoism; and sat in the chair when certain resolutions were carried, that the printer prosecuted for them, was sentenced to two years' imprisonment, and to pay a large fine.

"Such was Popery, in 1803, and such it is now. In Glasgow those things could not take place; but they may where the Papists are 19 to 1. Of all those things I was an eye witness. I saw Popery in this day what it was in the days of Henry IV. In case you should mention any of these circumstances in your publication, you have hundreds of witnesses on the spot to prove them. I am, &c."

As the above are not matters of private anecdote, it is not necessary that I give the name of the writer. My Kilkenny readers may satisfy themselves of their truth; and any person who has a correspondent in that quarter, may do the same. These few facts are worth fifty arguments, to show the true character of Popery. The mystery is, that men entitled to the privileges of free born British subjects, should submit to such intolerable tyranny; especially that a people so acute, and so high minded as the Irish, should submit to it. We have here presented, in a striking light, the power which the priests have over the bodies, and minds, and the property of the people; and, if the object of their dictation were the election of a member of Parliament, what freeholder would dare to refuse his vote to any candidate whom a bishop should set up, though he knew him to be a man who would use his influence to bring the kingdom under subjection to the see and the court of Rome?

The following narrative of a recent conversion from Popery, by means of reading the New Testament, was received lately by a gentleman of this city, from a friend in Ireland, who says, "you may rely on the account being true." "I send you a full account of the Harts, and the miraculous leadings of Providence in the course of their lives.—This venerable old man is now aged ninety, a strong man, of delightful countenance, sound judgment, and in good circumstances. He was religious in his way. His wife and he thought, as God was blessing them in temporals, they



should earn their everlasting salvation; and so to work they went. And as they were both just; liable to no penance by station; so when they concluded they had wrought out their salvation to all intents and purposes, overlooking the Lord in the matter. But over and above, they must do something for their friends, or to bequeath to whoever had most need. Called at the eleventh hour, I sat up almost all night to hear his account, and, O the depths! &c. This man had a large family of sons and daughters. Bartly, the oldest, was of a weak constitution; so he was educated for a priest. He obstinately refused the priesthood, which much displeased his father; but he gave him £30 to buy yarn, which sum did not last above two years. He then gave him £10 for hardware. Bartly from his youth was esteemed a little saint, and was up to all the orders and superstitions of Popery, which caused the father in a measure to overlook his disappointments. But to crown all, he married one of the lowest of the people, without his consent and without portion. They were soon in the depths of poverty. He lived two years in a hut, in a wild mountain; and none of his friends heard of him. At length poverty drove him to his father's house, where he was very coolly received. The father, however, gave him a small division of land; but he was so overloaded with superstition, that he got under seven orders, by which he fasted on one bad meal, for three days in a week, for a year, and, at some seasons, for twenty-four hours. He would travel from ten to twenty miles to perform a station. In these stations, they leave their skin and flesh upon the stones. The first station is fifteen miles off; they must travel bare-footed to the place, and then ascend the rocks, though a very ready passage otherwise, and at every marked place down upon their bare knees, till the top is gained; and though their feet and knees are much bruised, yet this is but an amusement to what follows.

“Upon the top of the mountain there is a round mount, of the circumference of about a hundred perches, of rough stone and gravel. Round this upon their bare knees they must go, until they are exhausted; and the descent, upon their return, is much more severe than the ascent; and for a great part of the way, they must creep on their hands and feet. O, said Bartly, if you had been there the day after me, you would have seen my flesh and blood upon the stones. But, said another brother, I saw him at B—l, where he had a great distance to go on his knees; and lest his whole weight would not be sufficient, he clasped his hand upon the crown of his head, to press himself with greater weight upon the stones. (The poor man, it seems, had not studied the laws of gravity.) Another brother declared, he was twelve months before he recovered the pains of his knees. He

did penance at Lough Derg, and many other stations after this, and yet obtained no peace of mind, and he often cried bitterly. In this state of mind he continued, until happening to read the lives of the saints, (a most superstitious book) O, said he, I have done nothing ! So he concluded he would leave wife and family, and starve himself to death. He got a coarse sack, and stitched it up to his chin, determining to wear it all his days instead of a shirt. In this state he continued many days. Distress was pressing hard upon him on the one hand, and agitation of mind on the other, for he neglected all business. But he determined to sell the little place that his father had given him, and commence pedlar again. Accordingly he sold it for £7. He and the family travelled until they entered the barony of Tyrnagh. Upon his arrival there, he heard of a Mr. Carlan, (a man who was designed for a priest, but recanted, of whom you might have heard much,) and a very bad report he every where heard of him ;—that he was termed swaddler, and had done very much harm. Thinks Bartly, if I could see him, I would soon confound his heresy, &c. He rambled on till he came to where Carlan was ; and he saw an Irish Testament with one of his scholars, and thought if he had £100, he would give it to be able to read it. He soon got into argument with Carlan ; and after finding, that he could read tolerably well, thinks he, if this book be true, I am wrong. From this he dates his conversion ; and, by reading and conversation, the Lord has not only opened his mind, but made him useful to others. The fear of man pressed hard on him, and he dreaded his friends' hearing of the change ; so he built a cabin in T——le, about 20 miles from his friends. The wonderful news reached the old father ; and the old man told me, it would have been joyful news, in comparison of this, if he had heard that his son had stolen a cow, and been hanged for it. But he still hoped it might be false. At length, says the youngest brother, John, I will go and hear the truth of all. At first, he made a furious charge upon Bartly, which he sustained with great patience ; and begged he would sit down and stay all night. Bartly took the Irish Testament. The novelty of it attracted the brother's attention, and he staid the second night ; and by the middle of the week, he was as confirmed a Protestant as Bartly himself ; and so they continued together fourteen days. By this time, the Lord had so strengthened Bartly, that neither fear nor shame prevented him from declaring the glad tidings of salvation to his fellow sinners. He ventured even to go to his father ; and leaving his brother in his place, he arrived at his father's at night ; and a trying scene ensued. There were none within but the old couple ; and as soon as the father knew it was Bartly, he leapt up and seized a cudgel, and made a dreadful blow at Bartly, who

evaded the blow, and with uplifted hands, prayed him to desist; but the old man repeated his blows, till the poor old woman grasped him, declaring, that she thought some of the blows would have killed his son; and thus she got him a little pacified. He was upon the whole a sober patient man; and when he became a little cool, he began to ask Bartly some questions. He took his Testament, and began to read and explain the way of salvation, showing how God could be just, and the justifier of the ungodly, exclusive of their own merits; and brought the doctrine so closely home, that the old people themselves were fully convinced. They related these matters with praise and joy; and told me also that the other son, Con. was not at home that night; but he being of a solid judgment, and naturally inquisitive after knowledge, when he had the nature of the gospel explained to him by Bartly, embraced the truth; and he is of infinite use in Bartly's absence, being engaged in every public place in defending the truth, and from his peaceable temper and sound judgment, there is attention paid to him, even by the enemies of the truth."

It will occur to the intelligent reader, that there is something uncommon in the conversion of this family. They yield to the power of truth more readily than is usual by decided enemies, whether popish or heathen. This, though uncommon, is by no means incredible. Conversion from sin to holiness is entirely of God; and though, in general, the strong principle of error, which has naturally possession of the human heart, does not yield without a protracted struggle, it yields under the influence of the Divine Spirit, as certainly in a moment as in a year. The story, however, is so respectably authenticated, that I have no doubt of its truth in every particular.

By the kindness of other correspondents, I have been put in possession of a great number of Popish tracts and books of devotion, lately printed in Dublin and Cork, which show, that, in point of doctrine, Popery in Ireland retains all the grossness of the darkest ages; and that the idolatry of saint-worship is inculcated as explicitly as ever it was in Italy or Spain. The following are the titles of some of the books which I refer to:—"Hell opened to Christians;" 1815; with most horrible cuts representing the torments of the damned. "Stations and Devotions on the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ crucified." Cork, 1814. "The Indulgences of the cord of St Francis." Dublin, 1797. "Rules of the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart of Jesus." Cork, 1815. "A Short Treatise of the antiquity, &c. of the most famous and ancient Confraternity of our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel; commonly called the Scapular." Dublin, no date. "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," &c. called the Catechism of the four Archbishops. "A Net for the Fishers of Men." Dublin, 1799.



“Meditations and Prayers, adapted to the Stations of the holy Way of the Cross.” Dublin, 1815. “The Path to Paradise : being the Catholic’s Companion to the most Adorable Sacrament of the Altar.” Dublin, 1820. “Bona Mors ; or the Art of Dying Happily in the congregation of Jesus Christ crucified, and of his condoling mother.” “The Life and Death of the most glorious Virgin Mary.” Dublin, 1814. “Some Reflections upon the Prerogatives, Power, and Protection of St. Joseph, spouse of the blessed and ever immaculate Virgin Mary.” Dublin, 1810. The last mentioned represents Joseph as an object of worship, trust, and confidence ; in heaven, next to his wife ; and gives a number of examples of persons applying to him in their distress, and receiving relief. It contains several hymns to his honour ; and forms of prayer addressed to him, of which take the following as a specimen :—“O holy Joseph, Virgin spouse of the Virgin mother of God ; most glorious advocate of all such as are in danger, or in their last agony ; and most faithful protector of all the servants of Mary, your dearest spouse. I, N. N. in the presence of Jesus and Mary, do from this moment choose you for my lord and master, for my powerful patron and advocate, for the obtaining a most happy death : and I firmly resolve and purpose never to forsake you, and never to say or do, or ever suffer any under my charge to say or do, any thing against your honour ; receive me therefore for your perpetual servant, and recommend me to the constant protection of Mary, your dearest spouse, and to the everlasting mercies of Jesus my Saviour”—And a great deal more to the same purpose.

Besides the gross impiety that pervades all these works, they are in point of style and taste deplorably low. They exhibit a beastly prostration of intellect, which compels one to think of Papists as if they were some degrees lower in the scale of being than their Protestant neighbours. Their most popular books are full of the most intolerable nonsense, as well as the most shocking blasphemy. Not to mention those whose titles I have given, I have before me a sermon preached by the present Pope, when he was bishop of Imola, in 1797, which is puffed up by the editor of the Orthodox Journal, in his number for last month, as a piece of extraordinary merit. As a fair specimen of the whole, I shall present the reader with the first sentence :—“The eternal displayed in time his omnipotence *outside himself*, and instantly appeared all created things.” I have often said that the God of Papists is not the God of the Bible ; and the present head of the Romish church confirms the assertion, by letting us know, that his God is such a one as himself, who has an inside and an out-side.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXV.

---

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23d, 1820.

---

I AM now about to enter upon a subject which I cannot look upon without some degree of anxiety, and even dismay, as it will scarcely be possible to do justice to it, without exciting, in the minds of my readers, feelings of abhorrence and disgust. I mean the constrained celibacy of the Romish priests. It is, however, a prominent part of the system of Popery, and one which has, as much as any other, laid the system open to the contempt and detestation of the world; and such a Work as that which I have undertaken, would be incomplete without a discussion of it, and an exposure of the monstrous wickedness which it has occasioned.

He who created man, declared concerning him, while yet in a state of innocency, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." Marriage was accordingly instituted in paradise, before sin entered into the world; and must, therefore, be considered as perfectly consistent with the most entire devotion to the service of God. After sin had entered, neither the man nor the woman was so capable of serving him as before; neither of them, indeed, could serve him at all, till renewed by faith in the promised Saviour, and sanctified by the grace of the Holy Spirit; but being so renewed, they were as capable of serving him while living together as man and wife, as if they had divorced each other, and a great deal more so. This union we find approved and blessed by God from the very beginning. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, seeing it was appointed by himself, for the preservation of the species, until the Messiah should come of the seed of the woman; and thereafter, until all the spiritual seed of the Messiah should be born into his family, which supposes their being first born into the world?

Christ himself honoured the union, by sanctioning the formation of it, on one occasion, by his presence; which we may be sure he would not have done, had there been any thing unlawful, or necessarily unholy in it; his inspired apostle, in the plainest language, asserts the lawfulness of every man having his own wife, and every woman her own husband; and the laws of Christ laid

down with regard to the duties of man and wife, clearly imply the lawfulness of the connexion.

I know it will be replied, that this is not the question. The Church of Rome, I shall be told, does not deny the lawfulness of marriage in general; but only that of the priests. But I ask, who are those priests on whose behalf such a distinction is made? If they are men, it is lawful for *every* man to have his own wife; and if they are not men, but fiends in human form, let them say so, and the world will know in what light to regard them.

It is not my intention to spend many Numbers on this subject. I feel like one treading on polluted ground, whose senses are assailed by offensive objects, and fetid effluvia; and shall endeavour to get over it as quickly as possible. I proceed, therefore, immediately, to lay down the doctrine of Rome upon this subject, and to expose its error and wickedness.

According to Bishop Hay, there are five things requisite in every one who is going to enter upon the priesthood; the last of which is, that "he be resolved to dedicate himself to the service of God, by perpetual chastity and celibacy." "Quest. Does the church oblige all those in sacred orders to live single and chaste? Ans. This she requires from them in the strictest manner, so as to decree the severest penalties against those among them who violate this law; having sometimes ordered them to be deposed, sometimes to be excommunicated, sometimes to be imprisoned in monasteries, to spend their whole lives in penance. And the great council of Trent pronounces an anathema upon any one who shall dare to affirm, that, notwithstanding this prohibition of the church, it is lawful for any of them to marry, or that such marriage would be lawful in the sight of God." *Sess. xxiv. can. 9.*

"Quest. On what principles does the church proceed, in so strictly prohibiting marriage to her clergy? Ans. Upon the following grounds laid down in the Holy Scripture: (1.) Because a life of purity and chastity is more excellent, more perfect, and more acceptable to God than the married state." In support of this strange proposition the author cites the words of Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 25, 27, 38. But the doctrine is founded upon a most unwarrantable assumption,—that the married state is not, and cannot be a state of purity and chastity. His words must signify this at least, else why place these virtues in contrast with the state of marriage? Had he put them in contrast with their opposite vices, he would have expressed a mere truism, which nobody would have disputed. But where does he find, that marriage is the opposite of purity and chastity? Certainly not in the Word of God; for there it is divinely ordained as the means of promoting and maintaining them; as the reader may see in the very chapter which the bishop refers to as above.

But what has this to do with the celibacy of the clergy as a



distinct order ? Paul was not addressing clergymen, but the church of God which was in Corinth ; and the whole chapter seems to be an answer to a letter which they had addressed to him, requesting his advice on the subject of marriage. This appears from the first verse. Now if the apostle had meant what the bishop would have him to mean, it would not be a prohibition of the clergy from marrying, for he asserts the right of himself to take a wife if he chose, and the practice of other apostles who had wives, in the 9th chap. verse 5th ; but it would be a prohibition of all Christians from marrying, which would be contrary to the general tenor of the Bible, and the avowed purpose of God with regard to his church.

Now the fact is, the apostle's answer to the letter which the Christians in Corinth had sent to him, was not meant as a *general* dissuasive from marriage. It does not contain the slightest hint that celibacy was more pleasing to God than matrimony ; but merely suggests some prudential considerations, suited to the time, and to the circumstances of those who had applied to him for advice and instruction. In giving his advice to the unmarried, he tells them that he does so in consideration of the "present distress," verse 26. In the distressing circumstances in which they were placed, and the sufferings which he foresaw they would be called to endure, he advised such as could conveniently remain single, rather to do so, than to involve themselves in the additional cares of a family. At the same time he left every individual to judge for himself, whether marrying or remaining single, would be most conducive to his own comfort and purity ; and if he found it to be the former, his advice was, by all means let him marry ; in doing so he sinneth not, which would not be true, were marriage less pleasing to God than celibacy. No man with a pure mind would ever think of honourable marriage as a state of impurity. Bishop Hay's words are a libel upon all the virtuous husbands and wives in the world ; and it is only because the minds and consciences of Romish priests are defiled by their own impure imaginations, and wicked practices, that they look upon that union which God has ordained, as less holy than the restrictions which they affect to impose upon themselves ; though it is well known that there is more of affectation than reality, in their professed abhorrence of impurity, and admiration of chastity.

Our right reverend prelate proceeds in his argument as follows :—" This is also manifest from the special reward promised by our Saviour, and bestowed in heaven upon those who lead a chaste life : our Saviour says, " Amen, I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or parents, or wife, for the kingdom of heaven's sake, who shall not receive much more in this present time, and in the world to come, life everlasting," Luke xviii. 29. Let the reader remember, that this passage is adduced to support

the doctrine, that it is more pleasing to God for a man not to have a wife, than to have one. And I ask every one who can read and understand the terms, whether they do not equally prove, that it is more pleasing to God to be without a house, than to have one; and to be without parents, than to have them? It would, indeed, tend very much to enhance the dignity of the Popish priesthood, if they could prove that they are personally, what was said of Melchisedec officially, that they are without father and mother, and that, like the image which fell from Jupiter, in the temple of Diana, they had dropt from the clouds. I hope they will thank me for this hint, which, if duly improved and followed up, may tend to excite greater veneration for their persons, than any imagination which could have entered into their own heads.

Christ's words in the passage cited, refer to circumstances in which the service of God may render it necessary for a man to forsake his nearest and dearest relatives, and even to lay down his life; but the question occurs again, What has this to do with the celibacy of the clergy? and the answer must be, Nothing at all.

Again, speaking of those who continue unmarried, the bishop proceeds:—"The singular privileges which shall be bestowed on them in heaven, are described by St. John, where he tells us, that they that have the name of the Lamb, and the name of his Father, written in their foreheads, to distinguish them in a special manner from all the other saints; that they sing a new song before the throne of God, which no other can sing but themselves; and that they follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, always attending his sacred person, as his chaste and beloved spouses; and describing those to whom such honours belong. "These are they," says he, "who were not defiled with women, for they are virgins." Rev. xiv. 1, 3, 4. And so, if we will take a Popish bishop's word for it, the "hundred and forty and four thousand," who surround the throne of the Lamb upon mount Sion, having his Father's name written in their foreheads, and who sing a new song, which none can learn but themselves, are to be considered merely as so many men and women who, in this world, chose to live unmarried. They are called the redeemed from the earth, to distinguish them from those who were not so redeemed; and therefore, according to the doctrine of this prelate, married persons can have no part in that redemption.

Such a mean and contracted idea of the church triumphant, could not possibly have place in the mind of any, but such as believe the Head of the church to be created by a priest, and exhibited to their view in the form of a wafer. The worshippers of a wafer god may readily believe their idol to have 144,000 spouses, and thus their religion appears to be nearly the same with Hindooism and Mahomedanism. But the plural number is never

used in Scripture, when speaking of the spouse of Christ. It is the one company of redeemed sinners ; that is, his church, which he purchased with his own blood, and which he sanctifies and cleanses by the washing of water through the Word, that is his spouse. This is the spouse that he will present to himself, a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing ; but holy and without blame before him in love, Eph. v. 26, 27. and so far is marriage from being a state that is not pleasing to God, that it is actually honoured by the Holy Spirit, in this very passage, by being used as a similitude, to represent the union between Christ and his church ; as it is in many other passages of the Bible.

The bishop seems to have considered the "hundred and forty four thousand," as a company consisting only of priests and nuns, and such as they, who had lived in celibacy. These, he says, have their Father's name written in their foreheads ; and he distinguishes them in a special manner from all the other saints. Now, if the above is to be taken literally as the specific number of persons, so highly favoured, what is to become of all the rest ? The number must have been made up many ages ago ; and it is vain for nuns and priests of the present day to expect admission into that company. The disciples of his reverence will perhaps reply, that out of the many millions who have lived in celibacy, since Popery became the prevailing religion in Europe, and who shall so live till the end of the world, there will not be found more than 144,000 who have actually kept the monastic vow. This I am by no means disposed to controvert ; but then, what becomes of the much vaunted superior purity and chastity of the monastic state of celibacy ?

But the bishop was too wise to commit himself, and the character of his *holy* order, by such an argument as the above ; and not knowing, perhaps, any better, he makes use of no argument at all to support his view of the passage ; and he takes care not to give the entire unmutilated words of the verses to which he refers, well knowing, that if he had done so, any child who could read, would have seen that they had no relation whatever to the doctrine which he was labouring to establish.

The "hundred and forty four thousand," I take to be a mystical number, meant to represent the church of Christ in a state of glory and perfection. It is mentioned as one feature in the character of these blessed persons, "These are they which were not defiled with women ; for they are virgins." The bishop will have this to signify, they were not married persons ; whereas, every one acquainted with the phraseology of the Bible, understands it to mean, they were steadfast in the faith of Christ, and devotion to him alone as their Lord and Saviour, and would not consent to give his glory to another. They are therefore distinguished from those who yielded themselves up to the whore who sitteth upon many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication. This mere-



tricious personage is no other than the Church of Rome, which usurped dominion over the nations, which are called many waters ; and the wickedness of the kings, or kingdoms of the earth, consisted in yielding themselves up to all her idolatries, and other abominations. (See Rev. xvii. throughout.) In hundreds of passages in the Old Testament, deviation from the worship of the true God, is compared to conjugal infidelity. Idolatry is called adultery and fornication ; and the apostle, adopting the Hebrew mode of expression, as he does in many other places, represents those who, in times of great temptation and suffering, during the period of antichrist's reign, should refuse to commit idolatry, or submit to her superstitious rites, as pure persons, as without spot before God ; that is, they were uncontaminated by the prevailing apostasy, and idol-worship ; they maintained their fidelity to their own God to the end of their lives ; and many of them suffered the loss of life on that very account. Thus the great company whom the apostle saw before the throne of God, so far from being the monks and nuns of the Romish Church, were those who never submitted to, but protested against the abominable idolatries of that most corrupt communion.

The conclusion which Bishop Hay draws from the foregoing premises, which I have given in his own words, with quotation marks, is as follows :—"Seeing, therefore, that the office of the priesthood requires the most angelical purity, and the most sublime sanctity in those who are admitted to it, therefore the church has judged proper to oblige all who enter into that office, to embrace the more perfect state of chastity." Here again he assumes it as admitted, that marriage and chastity are things opposed to one another ; than which nothing can be more opposite to the truth : but if it were true, it would not apply to priests only, but to all Christians without distinction ; for there is nothing, in point of holiness, required of persons who hold office in the church, which is not required of every member. It was not to the priests, but to the whole congregation of Israel, that the Lord said, "Be ye holy, for I the Lord your God am holy : " and the apostle Peter takes up the words, and addresses them as a divine command, not to clergymen merely, but to the whole body of the Christians, who were scattered through the provinces of the Lesser Asia, 1 Pet. i. 16. And another apostle tells us plainly, that "without holiness, *no man* (he does not say, *no priest*) shall see the Lord," Heb. xii. 14. The thing is certainly true of every priest ; but not more true with regard to him than any other man ; and if such holiness be inconsistent with the married state, then it is unlawful for any Christian to marry, and the human species must become extinct as soon as Christianity becomes universal ; for then there will be no more heathens, or unbelievers, or heretics, to preserve the race in existence in a lawful way.

I shall forbear answering the bishop's second reason, not because it is unanswerable ; but because I do not know how to do it in proper language. His third reason is founded on what the apostle advises the Corinthians to do, in their circumstances of peculiar distress ; but which was never meant as a general rule ; and if it were, it could not be made to bear upon the clergy in particular. His fourth reason may be touched without the necessity of being polluted ; and therefore, I shall give it entire : “ (4.) The duties of their state, as pastors of the flock of Jesus Christ, make the married state in a manner incompatible with their vocation ; for they are chosen by Jesus Christ, and separated from the rest of mankind, for the service of the gospel of God, Rom. i. 1. that they ‘ may go and bring forth fruit,’ in the conversion of souls to God, and ‘ that their fruit may remain,’ John xv. 16. They are dedicated, by their vocation, to this holy service of God, and his gospel ; and are obliged to give their whole attention to the good of their people’s souls ; to instruct them ; to administer the sacraments to them ; to comfort them in their distress ; to assist them in their sickness, and especially when death approaches ; and, for this purpose, to answer their calls at all times, by night or by day, even though at the risk of their own life, when the good of their people’s souls requires it. Now, it is evidently incompatible with the cares of a wife and family, to discharge all these duties properly ; and therefore St. Paul says, ‘ No man, being a soldier of God, entangleth himself with worldly business, that he may please him to whom he hath engaged himself,’ 2 Tim. ii. 4. Now, the church, well knowing that no kind of worldly business entangleth a man so much from the duties of the pastoral charge, as the cares of a wife and family ; therefore, on this account also, expressly requires of her pastors to abstain from a state so inconsistent with that charge.”

The church is here described as “ well knowing ” something ; but the accompanying remark shows her deplorable ignorance of the very subject under discussion. There is not one of the things mentioned as the duty of a faithful minister, at least not one that his Master imposes upon him, in which, so far from being hindered, he would not be assisted by an affectionate Christian wife. He who is single, must have some worldly care, were it only the cooking of his dinner, the making of his bed, and the washing and mending of his linens ; but he who has a wife can devolve all these, and the care of his children too, and fifty other things, upon her ; not that she will be able to do all with her own hands ; but she can see that all be done, so as to leave her husband absolutely without carefulness about this world, and all things in it, and leave him, if he be so disposed, to devote himself entirely to the spiritual duties of his office. I am not speaking of a mere possibility ; I am speaking of what I know to exist ; and hundreds of ministers

will say, Amen, to what I have here written. Popish priests cannot be judges of this question; for they know nothing of the matter. But the Holy Spirit, by his inspired apostles, has decided it, not by prohibiting ministers of the gospel from marrying; but by describing the character which their wives ought to sustain; which clearly implies, that it was lawful, and not unprofitable for them to have wives.

The bishop's fifth reason is a virtual concession of the point; for he asserts, what is true, that the apostles did not enjoin celibacy upon the bishops of the primitive church. "In the apostles' time," says he, "when the church began, there was a necessity for taking married people into the priesthood, because for want of hands, there was no room for choice; and, therefore, the apostles did not make any express law against doing so; yet we find the strongest injunctions in their sacred writings, that all who were admitted into that holy state should live chaste and continent lives; thus St. Paul affirms, that 'a bishop must be—sober, just, holy, continent,' Tit. i. 8; and writing to Timothy on the virtues proper for his state as a pastor, he says, 'be thou an example to the faithful, in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith, in chastity,' 1 Tim. iv. 12; and again, 'I charge thee before God, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels—keep thyself chaste.' 1 Tim. v. 21, 23; and giving a catalogue of the virtues belonging to the ministry of Christ, he says, 'In all things let us exhibit ourselves as the ministers of God in much patience—in chastity,' 2 Cor. vi. 4, 6. In consequence of this, we find, from the earliest monuments of antiquity, that, even when married people were admitted into the sacred ministry, they generally abstained from all cohabitation with their wives after that; till in process of time, when the number of the faithful increased, so that there was no difficulty of getting plenty of young people trained up to the service of the church, the law was made, for all the above reasons, obliging all who entered into sacred orders, to observe a perpetual chastity." Vol. 2. chap. 26.

Here it is plainly admitted, that whoever made this iniquitous law, Christ and his apostles had no hand in it. We shall trace its origin, and history, and deplorable consequences, in a future Number. In the meantime, I shall conclude with remarking, that his reverence, in citing the words of Paul to Timothy and Titus, respecting the qualifications of a bishop, takes special care to omit the words, (which must have stared him in the face, while he was passing them over) "the husband of one wife,—having faithful children," &c. He knew that most of those for whom he wrote had not the Bible, and that they would take his word for what was contained in it.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXVI.

---

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER, 30th, 1820.

---

AT the conclusion of my last Number, I gave the words of Bishop Hay in which he admits, that "in the apostles' time, when the church began," married men were received into the priesthood. He farther admits, that the apostles did not make any express law against it. Then what is the use of all his reasons for clerical celibacy, which he affects to find in the New Testament? By his own admission the writers of that blessed book ordained no such thing. They imposed no such burden upon either pastors or people. An honest controversialist would therefore have at once acknowledged, that the doctrine which he was maintaining was not to be found in the Bible; but only in the later writings of certain fathers, and in the acts of certain councils. But such was not Bishop Hay. He gave his Work the title of "*The Sincere Christian Instructed in the Faith of Christ from the Written Word;*" and therefore, to keep up the appearance of fulfilling the promise in his title page, he was obliged to make references to, or quotations from the Bible, though they had no relation whatever to the subject under discussion.

This is one of the ways by which the Word of God is notoriously abused and perverted by writers of the Romish Church; and by this means, when they cannot altogether keep the Bible out of the hands of the people, they succeed in making it void, or rendering it of no effect. This is done when the words of the inspired writers are quoted and applied to a purpose for which they were not originally intended; and when words are detached from their connexion, and made to express the very opposite of what the writer meant to express, and what he will be found to express, when the whole passage is read in connexion. Thus, as the reader will see in my last Number, Bishop Hay quotes from the apostolic writings, many passages which strongly enjoin the virtue of chastity on the bishops or pastors of churches. But he makes use of the word chastity as a thing that is inconsistent with, and opposed to the marriage relation; whereas the apostles use the word, and enjoin the virtue, not only as consistent with marriage, but as a virtue which marriage is eminently calculated to maintain; and for the very purpose of maintaining which, marriage is expressly enjoined. Thus the bishop quotes the apostle's words against the apostle's meaning. To do so even to an uninspired author

would be the greatest insult ; but this is an insult offered to the Holy Spirit, by whom the apostles were inspired.

The reason which our author gives for admitting married men to office in the primitive churches, is the necessity of the case ; because, "for want of hands there was no room for choice." But I ask, how did he come to know this ? Were there not twelve unmarried young men in all Judea, whom Jesus could have taken and qualified to be apostles ? We know that Peter was a married man, for one of Christ's first miracles was to cure his wife's mother of a fever, Mat. viii. 14. That others of the apostles, and particularly those who are called the Lord's brethren, were married men, is also certain from 1 Cor. ix. 5. Philip, one of the seven deacons, afterwards called an evangelist, had a family of daughters, Acts xxi. 9 ; and he did not call them nieces, as our Romish priests do their spurious female offspring, and sometimes their young mistresses. The Rhemish translators, indeed, in their note on the passage in which Peter's wife is mentioned, are pleased to tell us, that he did not cohabit with her after he became an apostle. If so, he began his apostleship with a breach of faith, and that too under the eye of his divine Master, which is not to be supposed without gross impiety. Besides, this is not very consistent with one of their own legends. There is among the Popish saints, one Petronilla, who is said to have been Peter's daughter, and who must have been born many years after her father was an apostle, because in the reign of the emperor Domitian, she was asked in marriage by one Flaccus ; and had she been born before her father was called to the apostleship, she would then have been about sixty years of age. This argument, though of no value in itself, ought to be of great weight with all papists. The testimony of the apostle Paul, however, is of more value ; and he, writing to the Corinthians, more than twenty years after Christ's ascension, speaks of Cephas then leading about his wife, as well as other apostles.

It is dishonouring to Christ to say that there was any necessity imposed upon him, in ordering the affairs of his kingdom ; that from want of materials for doing what was right, he was obliged to do wrong : yet this is the amount of Bishop Hay's argument. Christ had all power in heaven and in earth committed to him ; and could have converted and qualified all the unmarried persons in the Roman empire, to be evangelists, if he had seen this proper ; or had it been unlawful to employ married men in the work of the ministry. But he did employ married men in the honourable work of preaching the gospel ; and if it was lawful then, it is lawful still ; for there has been no later authority that could lawfully set aside his appointment.

In this, however, the Church of Rome proves herself to be the very antichrist. A prominent feature of her character is, "Forbidding to marry;" 1 Tim. iv. 3. and there is no other church in

the world to which the words are so truly applicable. The Rhemists, in their note upon the passage, endeavour to fix the charge upon some ancient heretics; but this cannot serve their purpose; for seeing they do the very thing themselves, it is no justification to say that ancient heretics did the same. The grave doctors seem to have felt extremely sore when touched upon this point; and not having much to say that could be called argument, they had, as usual, recourse to scolding. They ask, "Is it not now intolerable impudency of the Protestants, who, for a small similitude of words in the ears of the simple, apply this text to the fasts of the church, and the chastity of priests and religious?" So, it seems, forbidding to marry, is not forbidding to marry: between the two, there is only a small similitude of words in the ears of the simple; and he is an intolerably impudent man who shall say otherwise!

The same doctors wish to be understood as paying great respect to marriage, though they maintain it is a state not good enough for their priests. "The holy church," say they, "is so far from condemning wedlock, that she honoureth it much more than the Protestants, accounting it a holy sacrament; which they do not, but use it only to lust as the heathen do, and not to religion." And they translate the first clause of Ephesians v. 32;—"This is a great sacrament." Now there is here no doubt, an affection of great respect for the state of marriage, or rather the ceremony by which the contract of marriage is formed, which may properly enough be called a sacrament; for the proper meaning of the word is, an oath, or sacred pledge. But in the commonly received, or ecclesiastical meaning of the word sacrament, marriage has no more to do with it than any other action of a man's life, or any other event in his history; and it is rather an absurd way of honouring an institution to call it what it is not.

But to return to Bishop Hay:—"We find," says he, "from the earliest monuments of antiquity, that even when married people were admitted into the sacred ministry, they generally abstained from all cohabitation with their wives after that."—The most proper answer to this is a flat contradiction. The "earliest monuments of antiquity" are in the Bible; and there, there is not a word of what the bishop alleges; and if the allegation were true, it would prove nothing but that such entrants into the "sacred ministry," were guilty of great wickedness in forsaking their wives, or putting them away without any just cause. Heretics of different names did, indeed, at a very early period, revile the married state, calling it the invention of the devil. And some of the fathers, who were no better than great senseless children, speak of celibacy as a more holy state than marriage; but the bare unsupported speculations of such men ought to have no weight whatever with persons who have access to the Word of God, and their senses exercised to discern good and evil.



But as it may be worth while to show, that, "the earliest monuments of antiquity," after closing the canon of Scripture, are against the bishop's assertion, I shall present the reader with the following short summary: "Sanctioned by the example of the apostles, it is certain, that a vast many of the more distinguished primitive bishops and saints were engaged in the holy state of wedlock. St. Chrysostom, showing at large the expediency of marriage, intimates that several holy men were married. To mention a few eminent ones who were so, will be sufficient for my present purpose. The father of St. Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen, in Capadocia, who was bishop of the same see, was married during his episcopacy. The saint tells us that his mother, Nonna, was not only no impediment to her husband, in his ministry, but of great service to him."—"St. Gregory Nyssen, brother of St. Basil the Great, who lived in the fourth century, was married to Théosebia; and never forsook her. St. Basil's father, a bishop, and, by Alban Butler, denominated a saint, was married to Emilia, and had by her ten children; nine of whom survived him, and were all eminent for virtue. The reverend biographer tells us, in his life of St. Basil, on the authority of St. Gregory Nazianzen, that those among them who were married, and lived in the world, were no way inferior in piety to those who served God in holy virginity. Nicephorus speaks highly of St. Basil's married brother, St. Gregory Nyssen. Socrates tells us incidentally, that Spiridion, the distinguished bishop of Cyprus, was married; and likewise Eulalius, bishop of Cæsarea. And Eusebius relates that Chœremon, bishop of a city called Nile, fled to the mountain Arabius, with his wife, during one of the persecutions. It would be easy to swell the number of instances of this sort by the addition of those numerous similar ones which Vicellius supplies; but this would evidently be superfluous: inasmuch as the main point to be established is not whether many prominent individuals of the Christian hierarchy were married, after the example of the apostles, but whether, in early, and comparatively pure times; whether, when the instructions of the evangelists and apostles were of permanent authority; whether, before the pastors of the Christian church became rather generally disposed to emulate heresiarchs, and conciliate heathens; and whether, before temporal concerns had become intimately blended with ecclesiastical government, the generality of the clergy were married or not. And that they were so, throughout the Christian world, at least till the beginning of the seventh century, notwithstanding the almost incessant endeavours of the Popes, and the successive dissuasions of the philosophical fathers, to prevent their marriage, is, I maintain, incontrovertible.

"The only attempt which appears to have been made, antecedently to the fourth century, to induce the clergy by the exercise of episcopal authority, to practise celibacy, was that of Pynetus,

bishop of Crete, about the year 170. But that attempt was seasonably discountenanced and frustrated by the pious primitive Dionysius, bishop of Corinth; who advised the former, in an epistle which he wrote to him on that subject, "not to impose the heavy burden of continence upon his brethren, but to have regard to the infirmity of many." "Socrates and Nicephorus give us to understand that, in their respective ages, sacerdotal matrimony was common all over the east. And the twelfth canon of the Quinisext council informs us, that in Africa, Lybia, and other regions which belonged to the western, or Latin division of the Christian world, many *most religious* men who presided over the church (and whose examples were, no doubt, followed by the generality of the clergy) lived in the matrimonial state. It is true, that the bishops of that council disapproved of, and prohibited that practice: the fact, however, is that alone about which I am at present concerned."—"St. Jerome says, that it was customary for deacons to marry before ordination, in order that marriage might not prove an obstacle to their advancement to the higher orders. And, in another place, he acknowledges, that married men were more frequently elected bishops than those who were single. The learned historian, Zonarus, who lived in the twelfth century, commenting on the fifth of the apostolic canons, speaks thus: 'This canon reminds us of the fact of even bishops having wives: for even bishops were not then prohibited from engaging in lawful connexion with women.' And the learned Balsamon, who became patriarch of Antioch about the end of the same century, commenting upon the same canon, says, 'Before the sixth synod, which was held in the palace of Trullo, it was lawful for bishops to have wives, even after obtaining the episcopal dignity.'" *Letters on Constrained Celibacy, Let. IX.*

The writer above quoted, proceeds to show that clerical matrimony was sanctioned by a number of councils. He does not only refer to his authorities; but he gives the very words in the original languages for the satisfaction of his learned readers. I do not know who the writer is; but he is evidently a man of great industry and research; and he writes like one who has no hostile feeling towards the church of Rome as a whole; but on the one point to which he has directed his attention, he certainly does exhibit her as the mother of abominations.

"The monk Augustin," says the author of the letters, *Let. XVI.* "acting on the instructions of Gregory the Great, was the first who attempted to enforce celibacy among the British clergy: and in order to facilitate his attempt, which was made in the year 600, he began, under the expressed permission of the Pope, with limiting it to the higher orders; although Leo had extended it to sub-deacons in all other parts of Europe, about one hundred and sixty years before. His attempt, however, proved abortive. In the year 975, Dunstan, another of the Pope's agents,

followed his example ; but his endeavours were equally unavailing : and, moreover, occasioned great disturbances. In the year 1102, Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, a primate, at least as devoted to the will of the Pope as any of his predecessors had been, induced the prelates, who composed the then council of London, to require imperatively the total abstinence of the clergy from their wives ; but the consequences of this rigorous requisition were soon found to be shocking in the extreme, as I shall notice hereafter. Shocking, however, as they were, they had no effect whatsoever in dissuading the obsequious creatures of the Pope, from prosecuting their endeavours to substitute his tyrannical obligations in the place of evangelical liberty : for by the council which was assembled in London, in the year 1108, a decree was issued, purporting, that those priests who had not complied with the prohibition of the council of 1102, should either relinquish their wives, or forbear to say mass. The law of celibacy was further enforced by Pope Innocent II. in the year 1138 ; and at the same time (you will blush, my friend, on the recollection of the fact) those priests who had abandoned their wives, with whom they had become, as our Lord tells us, one flesh, indissolubly connected, in a mysterious manner, as himself to his true church, were tolerated in keeping concubines ; and thus was the law of God, as declared by Moses, and by our blessed Saviour, outraged in a two-fold manner. But still, as we learn from Bale, who wrote in the 15th century, many learned and respectable clergymen persevered in their bounden fidelity to their wives. The sons of the married clergy, who officiated in the churches of England, were so numerous, about forty years before, that Pope Paschal II. in a letter to Anselm, giving him a dispensation to admit them to holy orders, assigned as his motive for doing so, that they constituted the greater and *better* part of the clergy."

The Pope, however, prevailed at last, as he did in almost every other scheme which he tried for the advancement of his own power, and the enslaving of the human race. He found that the clergy were never sufficiently devoted to his service ; never enough detached from the ties of kindred and country, while they were allowed to form conjugal connexions, and enjoy the endearments of a family. When he had prevailed upon them to relinquish all these, they became like men who had no particular interest in one country more than another. They were then the fit agents of his holiness, for promoting the honour and the interest of the see of Rome, in all parts of the world. Hundreds of thousands of them were saddled upon the nations of Europe, having scarcely any common interest with the people of these nations ; and whose daily business it was to oppress and impoverish them, under the pretext of promoting the glory of God, and of the holy catholic church. It was not enough that men, in what is called holy orders, were compelled to separate themselves from domestic so-



ciety ; but hundreds of thousands of young women were doomed also to forego the society of parents, sisters, and brothers, and to spend their days in seclusion and celibacy, contrary to the design of their creation, and the express command of God. An inspired apostle teaches :—"I will that the younger women marry, bear children," &c. 1 Tim. v. 14. but partly by compulsion, and partly by allurements, vast multitudes of young women, in Popish countries, are shut up from the world, and obliged to take a vow that they will never marry, while many of them may be scarcely of an age to make a voluntary choice, whether they would prefer a single life or not. And the holy church is incessantly teaching, that celibacy is better, and more pleasing to God than marriage ; that in short, the state has great merit before God ; that those who abstain from marriage, become the favourites and the spouses of Christ ; and thus the church becomes accessory to the everlasting perdition of those who perish through the belief of her lie.

The writer of the Letters on Celibacy, promised to show the shocking consequences that followed the imposition thus imposed upon both sexes : and he fulfils his promise in the most ample manner. I cannot, however, allow myself to follow him, or to quote his disgusting details, though the worst of them are given in Latin, without a translation. There is enough indeed in English, to fill every delicate mind with horror, even, at this day, when, in every Newspaper, scenes of licentiousness are laid open to persons of all classes and ages. Certain facts, however, must be mentioned, to show that I am not proceeding upon the ground of vague general accusation.

"The practical libidinousness of the unmarried clergy was, every where, enormous and unbridled. Such was the dread which the people of Switzerland entertained of these reputed representatives of the Holy Ghost, that, as we are informed by Sleiden, they required them, in some of the cantons, to keep concubines, in order to prevent them violating their daughters and wives. (*Com. l. 3.*) The same reason induced the senate of Rome, as we learn from Thuanus, to petition the Pope for the continuation of the brothels, which he had intended to suppress. (*His. l. 39.*) Gualtier Mapes complained that the priests found means to excite in silly women a fear of damnation if they denied their persons to them." There is a host of authorities, almost entirely of the Church of Rome, and great dignitaries too, who concur in complaining of the unbounded licentiousness of the clergy ; and they at last became so hardened in wickedness as to teach, that the greatest crimes were only venial sins, or scarcely any sin at all. "The obsequious divines Coster and Campeggio, held that priests were more criminal in marrying, than in keeping many harlots. (*Cost. de cæl. sacerd. prop. 9.*) And, perhaps, to allay the scruples of some libidinous confessors, adultery was authoritatively ranked among the lesser sins."

"In the remonstrance which certain divines of Germany presented to the Pope, accompanied by letters from the Emperor Ferdinand, and Albert Duke of Bavaria, soliciting permission for the clergy to marry, these divines assert, that 'among fifty catholic priests, hardly one will be found who is not a notorious fornicator.' They observe its having been maintained, by Cardinal Panormitan, that it would conduce to the salvation of souls, to permit the clergy to marry: and consider it a great absurdity (it was indeed much worse than an absurdity) not to admit married clerks; and yet to tolerate fornicators. (*P. Sarp. Hist. Con. Trent. p. 678.*) This remonstrance is said to have made such a strong impression on the Pope, that he resolved to assemble pious and learned men at Rome, from all parts of Europe, to discuss the question, but was dissuaded from doing so by Cardinal Simonetta, for reasons of state." (*ibid.*) *Letters, &c. Let. xx.* It is easy to imagine what the reasons of state were. The priesthood had become so generally, nay, I may say, universally profligate, that to attempt to confine them to matrimony, might have endangered the stability of the papal throne. Fleury relates of Rasfold, Bishop of Munster, "that having received briefs from the pope, requiring him to banish concubines, and having published these orders in his diocese, he was mutinously opposed by all his canons. Disgusted with their scandalous lives, he, at length, voluntarily quitted his bishoprick." (*Letters, &c. p. 302.*) "The learned Aventinus, who lived in the early part of the 16th century, speaking of the clergy, in his life of Gregory VII. says, the greatest part of them, under the honourable name of chastity, committed every where, with impunity, fornication, incest, and adultery. Of the law of celibacy, he says, that law was by no means displeasing to certain clergymen, who, instead of one wife, *sexcentas jam mulierculas licebat inire.*" *Ibid. p. 268.*

It was as early as the Pontificate of Gregory the Great, that six thousand heads of murdered infants, the fruits of illicit sexual intercourse, were found in a fish pond: a discovery which, as Balæus informs us, induced Gregory to revoke the law of celibacy; which was however revived about forty-five years after, by Martin I. See *Letters, &c. page 278.* Now if such horrible effects resulted from the celibacy of priests and nuns, as early as the 7th century, what must not have taken place during the many dark ages that followed, among the thousands of what were called religious houses; but which were in fact brothels of the worst character, upon a large scale? In them was acted such scenes, that Cardinal Damiano published a complaint, in a book which he entitled "Gomorrhah," because, I suppose, the wickedness of these religious persons, reminded him of that of the five cities which God destroyed by fire and brimstone from heaven.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXVII.

---

SATURDAY, OCTOBER, 7th, 1820.

---

AMONG the causes that facilitated the Reformation in both England and Scotland, the profligacy of the clergy was none of the least considerable. The satirical poems of Chaucer in the former kingdom, and those of Sir David Lindsay and others in the latter, must have had a powerful effect upon the public mind. Rude as the bulk of the people may have been in point of knowledge, they could not but see the absurdity and the wickedness of men professing to be too holy to live in the state of marriage, while they were well known to keep their concubines, and to indulge themselves in all manner of licentiousness. That such was their conduct there is the concurrent testimony of all historians, even of their own faith, though modern Papists will deny it; and their Scotch oracle, Bishop Hay, labours to persuade his readers, that "nothing is more unjust than the conduct of mankind on this head;" that is, the conduct of mankind in asserting that there are many of the clergy who transgress the law of celibacy, notwithstanding their great obligations to observe it. He admits that there have been "some;" that there have been "a few," who have transgressed; and he speaks as if this were no more than what may be expected "while men are men." He compares it to a Judas among the twelve apostles; a Nicholas among the seven deacons; an Ananias and Sapphira among the first Christians; an incestuous person among the disciples in Corinth. "No wonder, then," says he, "that among such great numbers as enter into the ministry of the church, some should be found who are a scandal to their character. But surely nothing can be more unjust and unreasonable, than to condemn that state of itself, because some of its members do not live up to the sanctity of it, or to attribute to the whole, what is only the fault of a few; yet such is the judgment of the world." After enlarging a little on the injustice of thus accusing the holy priesthood, in general, the author comforts his brethren with the following words: "But we need not be surprised at this, because our blessed Master himself says to his apostles, and in them to all their successors, 'If the world hate you, know ye that it hated me before you. If you



had been of the world, the world would love its own ; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hates you.' John xv. 18, 19." *Vol. ii. p. 141.*

These words the bishop considers as addressed to the successors of the apostles, as well as to the apostles themselves. They are addressed therefore to every priest of the Romish church without exception ; for they are all successors of the apostles. The grossest wickedness in their practice does not infer the forfeiture of this character, unless they shall be deprived by canonical authority ; and there are few crimes that will incur this sentence, except matrimony and heresy. All the world knows that heresy is one of the greatest crimes, and one for which many priests have been deprived of their holy orders, and burnt to death ; and as for matrimony, this author tells us, that the church has decreed the severest penalties against such priests as shall be guilty of it, "having sometimes ordered them to be deposed, sometimes to be excommunicated, sometimes to be imprisoned in monasteries, to spend their whole lives in penance." (See No. CXV, page 82.) Add to all this, the great curse which the Council of Trent pronounces against them, and it will appear, that matrimony in a priest is a crime of the first magnitude ; but the holy fathers of the church may practise fornication, and even adultery, to any extent, without the least risk of being deprived of their holy orders, or degraded from being successors of the apostles : and when this fact is mentioned, for a fact it is, and when examples are given in detail, the bishop falls a wailing about the injustice that is done to men of his own order, and with unparalleled impudence, he applies for their comfort, the words which Christ addresses to his really holy and persecuted disciples.

Bishop Hay's representation, that lewd priests were only few in number, is a barefaced imposition upon his readers ; for he could not but know the truth of the matter. But suppose, for argument's sake, that they were as few in proportion as a Judas among the twelve apostles, or one incestuous person in the church in Corinth, there is no injustice or unreasonableness in charging the wickedness of it upon the whole body, seeing it is tolerated by the whole. Judas separated himself from the company of the apostles. Ananias and Sapphira were by divine interposition separated from the church the moment their crime was discovered. Nothing was known against Nicholas when he was appointed to the deacon's office ; and if it be true that he was the father of the sect of Nicholaitans, which is not absolutely certain, we know that the Head of the church condemned their deeds, and censured the churches that gave them any countenance ; (see Rev. ii.) so that any church that suffered them to remain among them, would justly be charged with their crimes : and the church in Corinth is actually charged by the apostle Paul with the guilt of the in-

cestuous person, until they put him away; and in doing so, they cleared themselves of the matter. But the Church of Rome has never cleared itself of the guilt of suffering an abandoned and lascivious priesthood, and therefore the whole are justly chargeable with it.

Nay, it can be shown that concubinage was publicly allowed to the Romish priests for a small commutation or fine. On this subject a host of authorities might be produced. Among others, the work entitled, "Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery," is a standing evidence that a priest was allowed to keep a concubine for the easy annual charge of half-a-guinea. I gave extracts from this book in an early part of my work; and though Amicus Veritatis was pleased to deny its authenticity, he has not attempted to oppose to it any higher authority than his own word, which, without his real name, is of no value; and I shall not presume to say what it would be worth even with his name. I shall here, however, give a name of real value and weight in the Church of Rome, and repeat some of the words which I gave, vol. I. part i. page 25: "Shameful to relate! they give permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And, in some places, they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying, that they may keep a concubine if they please. *There is a printed book which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, The Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the books of the summists.* And of these crimes there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." *Claudius Espenceus Com. ad cap. i. Epist. ad Titum, degress. ii.*

This Claude D'Espence was a divine of great note in the Romish Church, and one whose word it would not be expedient for Papists to call in question. Let us see then how they evade the force of his testimony. The Catholic Vindicator, on whom Pax and Amicus Veritatis devolved the defence of their church, quotes from my work, and replies as follows:—"I have proved, (he continues) in the words of a celebrated divine of the Romish church, that of the greatest crimes there were some that persons might have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they had been committed, might be bought. Such were my words and those of D'Espence, as repeated by me. But it so happened, that in the page in which I first quoted D'Espence's words, some inches farther down, I mentioned the name of Dupin. This afforded the Vindicator a loop-hole for escape, of which he took advantage in the following manner: "This celebrated Romish divine is no other than Dupin, whose

works were condemned by the Sorbonne in 1693.”—And then he gives one of my quotations from Dupin, relating to another part of the subject. See *Cath. Vind. No. I. col. 7*. If the reader will take the trouble of comparing this with the passage of THE PROTESTANT, above referred to, and also with the 3d page of No. I. in which I repeated part of the words, with D’Espence’s name, without Dupin being within sight, which latter is the passage which the Vindicator quotes, he will see, that it was not possible to substitute the one name for the other from mere mistake; but that the Vindicator must have done it purposely to deceive his readers. He dreaded the impression that was likely to be made by the authority of an unimpeachable witness, with regard to the abandoned lives of the Popish clergy, and therefore he ascribes the assertion of the fact to an author whom he considers unworthy of credit, because, it seems, his works had been condemned by the Sorbonne. It does not appear how this could affect his credibility with regard to matters of fact, which are asserted by other historians; but it was quite enough to serve the Vindicator’s purpose with his Popish readers. This piece of deceit in the Vindicator’s first Number, showed me what I had to expect in the sequel of his work; and my expectations were not disappointed. I could not, however, find a proper opportunity of introducing the subject till now.

Considering the above, and what is contained in my last Number, sufficient to establish the fact of the profligacy of the Popish clergy in general, I shall now proceed to give a more particular account of them, as they appear in the histories of our own country. Dr. Henry, in his *History of Britain*, cent. xv. makes the following curious statement: “At the king’s command, the University of Oxford drew up a catalogue of those abuses in the church that needed reformation, to be laid before the Council of Constance. This catalogue consists of forty-six articles, and (although it was composed by clergymen) gives a most odious picture of the manners of the clergy at this period, particularly of their avarice and debauchery. Of each of these it will be sufficient to give one example. In the 27th article it is said, ‘It is notorious, that when a Pagan or Jew, abandoning his former errors, desires to be purified in the holy fount of baptism, all his temporal goods are confiscated to the church; which, it is believed, prevents many Jews from being baptized. It would be pious and meritorious in the council to remedy this abuse. For when Philip baptized the Eunuch, he did not seize his chariot, or other goods he had about him, at his baptism.’ The 38th article represents, ‘That the carnal and debauched lives of the clergy in our days, and their public fornications, which are never punished, (except perhaps with a small fine in private), set an evil example before others; it would therefore be a holy thing, and contribute to the



reformation of the church, if priests, of every rank and order, who were public fornicators, were obliged to abstain from saying mass for a limited time.”

The above Report, drawn up by clergymen of the University of Oxford, plainly asserts the fact of the general profligacy of their brethren; and that they considered the offenders as brethren, is evident from the very slight punishment which they proposed to inflict upon clergymen who were “public fornicators;” namely, that they should be “obliged to abstain from saying mass for a limited time.” Whereas, had any one of them presumed to marry a wife, he would have been deposed, excommunicated, and perhaps imprisoned in a convent for life, to do penance for his crime. “Archbishop Bouchier,” (says the same historian,) “in a commission he granted to his commissary-general to attempt some reformation, says, that many of the clergy, both secular and regular, were ignorant, illiterate blockheads, or rather idiots; and that they were as profligate as they were ignorant, neglecting their cures, strolling about the country with bad women in their company, spending the revenues of their benefices in feasting and drinking, in fornication and adultery.”

This worthy primate died in 1486, and was succeeded by John Morton, Bishop of Ely, who appeared extremely desirous of reforming the clergy. Complaints of their enormous wickedness were made from all quarters; and even the preachers at St. Paul’s Cross were bold enough to declaim against their vices in the hearing of the laity. Archbishop Morton, in the abundance of his zeal, published a pastoral letter, calling upon his clergy to reform themselves. “In this letter,” says Dr. Henry, “the good primate doth not trouble his clergy with recommending a single virtue, or reproving a single vice; but he charges them, with great solemnity, not to wear short liripoops of silk, nor gowns open before, nor swords, nor daggers, nor embroidered girdles; to be very careful of their tonsure, and to keep their hair always so short, that the world may see their ears; and he threatens them with very severe censures if they do not obey these injunctions.” Such was all the reformation that at first appeared to the primate of all England, as necessary among the clergy under his command.

By and by, however, he came to a better understanding of matters; for, in a letter to the abbot of St. Albans, which has been published, he charges him and his monks with the most odious vices, of which, he says, they were notoriously guilty. One of his crimes was, that he had turned all the modest women out of the two nunneries of Pray, and Sapwell, and filled them with prostitutes; that they were esteemed no better than brothels, and that he and his monks publicly frequented them as such. Such was the character and condition of these holy seminaries in the reign of Henry VII., and down to the period of the Reformation. For many more particulars, see Henry’s History, cent. xv.

On the breaking out of the Reformation, Henry VIII. ordered a visitation of certain monasteries, in order to their suppression. The following was the result, as given by Dr. Henry, cent. xvi., who refers to Strype, chap. 34, 35. "The visitors having received their commissions and instructions, were despatched into different parts of the kingdom at the same time, that the monks might have as little warning of their approach as possible. They executed their commissions with zeal and diligence, and made some curious discoveries almost in every house, not much to the honour of its inhabitants. In making these discoveries, they were greatly indebted to the violent factions which reigned among the monks and nuns, who informed against one another, and against their superiors. Accounts of their proceedings were transmitted by the visitors to the vicar-general, and contained sufficient materials to render the monastics completely infamous, and the objects of universal detestation, for their gross absurd superstition and idolatry, their infernal cruelty, their shameful impositions on the credulity of the people, their abandoned unnatural incontinency, their drunkenness, gluttony, and other vices. Some of the old abbots and friars did not attempt to conceal their amours, which they knew to be impossible. The holy father, the prior of Maiden-Bradley, assured the visitors, that he had only married six of his sons and one of his daughters out of the goods of the priory as yet; but that several more of his children were grown up, and would soon be marriageable. He produced a dispensation from the Pope, permitting him to keep a mistress; and he acquainted them that he took none but young maidens to be his mistresses, the handsomest he could procure; and when he was disposed to change, he got them husbands. But the page of history must not be stained with the abominations contained in the reports of these visitors. It may be sufficient to lay before the reader, a short description of their contents in the preamble to the Act of Parliament which they produced: 'Forasmuch as manifest sin, vicious, carnal, and abominable living, is daily used and committed in abbeys, priories, and other religious houses, of monks, canons, and nuns; and albeit, many continual visitations have been heretofore had by the space of two hundred years and more, for an honest, charitable reformation of such unthrifty, carnal, and abominable living; yet nevertheless, little or none amendment is hitherto had, but their vicious living shamefully increaseth and augmenteth,' &c. It is but justice to notice, that though the corruption of the monastics in England at this time was very general, it was not universal: some in almost every monastery were regular in their conduct, and at their own desire were set at liberty. A few convents were found to be well governed and unexceptionable: and for the preservation of these the visitors pleaded with great earnestness."

In Scotland the state of matters was no better than in England, whatever worse. "Inferior benefices were put up to sale, or be-

stowed on the illiterate and unworthy minions of courtiers; on dice-players, strolling bards, and the bastards of bishops." M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, 1st ed. p. 15. "Again, (says the same author, page 16.) the lives of the clergy, exempted from secular jurisdiction, and corrupted by wealth and idleness, were become a scandal to religion, and an outrage to decency. While they professed chastity, and prohibited, under the severest penalties, any of the ecclesiastical order from contracting lawful wedlock, the bishops set the example of the most shameless profligacy before the inferior clergy; avowedly kept their harlots; provided their natural sons with benefices; and gave their daughters in marriage to the sons of the nobility and principal gentry; many of whom were so mean as to contaminate the blood of their families by such base alliances, for the sake of the rich dowries which they brought." The author adds in a note, "We need not appeal to the testimony of the Reformers, or to satirical poems published at the time, in proof of the extreme profligacy of the Popish clergy. The truth is registered in the acts of parliament, in the decrees of their own councils, (Wilkin. Concil. tom. 4. p. 46—60. Keith's *Hist.* pref. 11.) in the records of legitimation, (Lord Hailes' *Notes on Ancient Scottish Poems*, p. 249, 250.) and in the confession of their own writers, &c." In another note, Dr. M. gives the following on the authority of Pitscottie: "They would thole no priest to marry, but they would punish, and burn him to the dead; but if he had used then ten thousand whores he had not been burnt." *Hist.* p. 150, 152.

As an instance of what Dr. M'Crie mentions, of bishops marrying their natural children into noble families, I need only refer to the case of Cardinal Beaton, who, having burnt Wishart to death for heresy, seemed to have the whole kingdom at his feet. He had settled with the Earl of Crawford, the preliminaries of marriage between that earl's eldest son and one of his natural daughters, named Margaret, with whom he gave a very large fortune; and had just celebrated the marriage, when, on his return to his castle at St. Andrews, he was murdered, as is recorded in all the histories of that time.

If Romish priests at present in England and Scotland are not more virtuous, they are under the necessity of being more circumspect, and more private in the practice of their vices. But in those parts of Ireland which have been least favoured with the light of the Reformation, we are informed by one of themselves, that the lives of the clergy are nearly as profligate as ever. "That the lives of the Roman Catholic clergy, at this day, in Ireland," says the Rev. Charles Bourke, "as well as on the Continent, are not much more correct than those of the clergy at the time of the Reformation, when Luther inveighed against them, is a melancholy truth which cannot be denied." Again, "The mistresses and children of reverend gentlemen can be shown, whenever they may



choose to put it to the trial.—They themselves know that I can prove this assertion incontestably.” See *Popish Episcopal Tyranny Exposed*, preface, and page 45.

Hence it is, I suppose, that Popish writers continue so pertinaciously to accuse the reformers of unchastity. They know how vulnerable the character of their own clergy is on this point; and, in order to divert the attention of their opponents, and put them on the defensive, they become the assailants and accusers. In almost all their writings it is asserted as an undoubted matter of fact, that Luther both taught and practised this vice; though it is a fact, that among the many thousands of enemies which he had during his life, there were none that could produce the smallest evidence of any thing worse than that he married a *religious* woman; that is, a woman, who, like himself, was under a vow of chastity. Similar accusations were brought against other leaders of the Reformation, with an equal disregard of truth; and it is not more than two years since a reverend father had the effrontery to assert in the pulpit of the Popish chapel here, that Knox plundered the cathedral of St. Andrews of its sacred vessels, and used them in drunken revelry with his concubines. Knox was a married man, and after the death of one wife he took another. This is the worst that his enemies can prove against him; and yet it is under this that the above monstrous charge is made, because Papists will not allow that ladies whom priests marry can be their lawful wives, and therefore they apply the above opprobrious epithet.

I need not here discuss the lawfulness of breaking the monastic vow; but I have no hesitation in saying, that so far as it is a vow of chastity, it would, in the case of most persons, stand more chance of being observed in the state of marriage, than in the state of celibacy. This is plainly the doctrine laid down by the apostle, 1 Cor. vii. 2. As the first reformers saw it their duty to marry, so in the reformation that has lately begun in Germany, under Von Wessenberg, this privilege is allowed to the priests, which is striking at the foundation of the Papal power in that quarter. This is the principal crime that the Pope lays to the charge of the modern reformer, which is done in the following words, in a document signed by Cardinal Gonsalvi: “The nunciature of Lucerne lost no time in transmitting to your curia, as it was in duty bound to do, the strongest representations against such enormous and grave abuses, and especially against the *greatest of all*, namely, that of giving the power of marriage to persons dedicated to God by a vow of perpetual chastity.” *Reformation of the Catholic Church in Germany, &c. Lond. 1819, page 24.*

THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CXVIII.

---

SATURDAY, OCTOBER, 14th, 1820.

---

IT would be easy to fill a dozen Numbers more with details of the horrible effects of clerical celibacy in the Church of Rome. The general licentiousness which it occasioned was not confined to the lower orders of the priesthood. All ranks were tainted up to the very head; and the head of the church himself was often worst of all. One can scarcely open the Lives of the Popes from the sixth century to the sixteenth, but he will find the most disgusting accounts of their debaucheries, and of the oppressions which they practised in order to provide fortunes for their natural children, whom they introduced to the world as nephews and nieces. But the world does not need to be informed on this subject; and I believe my readers will think they have had enough of matter so nauseous.

There is one thing more connected with this subject, to which I will advert in few words, and then proceed to something else: it is the inconsistency of calling matrimony a sacrament, and denying it to the clergy. In all other cases the priesthood insist upon having at least their own share of the good things of the church. The ordinances of divine appointment which are called sacraments, are given to the church as benefits; and they are signs of greater blessings than appear to the eye. The Church of Rome has made several foolish additions to their number; but she holds them all as good things, and profitable to be observed. She indeed uses stronger language than any judicious Protestant will do. "A sacrament," says Bishop Hay, "is an outward sensible action, or sacred sign, ordained by Jesus Christ, as *a sure and certain means* to bring grace to our souls." The subject is too serious for a pun, else I would defy the Church of Rome to prove that all their sacraments are *sensible*\* actions: at least, not that

\* I am not sure if this word is used in the sense of wise, or judicious, or having good sense, south of the Tweed.

one that sets all the senses at defiance. I will not, however, refuse this character to marriage; and if it be indeed a sacrament, and a sure and certain means to bring grace to the soul, I am sure it must be the most sensible thing the priests ever did, to take wives, and live like honest men. And perhaps it is because they neglect this sacrament, that all the other six have failed of their sure and certain effect with regard to many of them, as is but too evident from their graceless lives.

It is not my usual practice to begin a Number with the end of a subject, but sometimes, as in this instance, I find it expedient.\*

Before entering upon another general head of discussion, I shall give place to a correspondent or two. The following is from my Galloway "Friend to fair dealing," whom I suspected to be a priest, and perhaps this is the principal reason why he is so very angry. If the reader will take the trouble of turning to my XCV. Number, in Vol. 2d, he will see that I inserted only a part of

\* Since writing the above, I have received the following communications, which I throw into a note here. The two anecdotes are not over decent, but they are such as one must expect to meet with, in reading on such a subject. My correspondent, who resides in Ireland, has given me the names of living authorities for both:—"A Roman Catholic gentleman, in the north of Munster, somewhat advanced in years, married a young and handsome wife, of the same communion. Naturally of a jealous disposition, and convinced of the corrupt principles and practices of his clergy, he would never permit the priest of the parish, or the friar who assisted him, to hear his wife's confession locked up together in a private room, according to the usual custom. But once a month, when the confession was to be heard, the priest attended for the purpose; and was obliged to *shrive* and absolve the lady in the lawn before the hall door, whilst the watchful husband sat in one of the windows of his drawing room, the rigid guardian of his wife's chastity, and his own honour." The following is of a more disgusting character:—"A full fed father Luke, in the county of Cavan, some years ago, had in vain attempted to seduce the affections of one of his fair parishioners. Soon after his repulse, he was consulted by the girl's father, on the disposal of her in marriage to a young man in a neighbouring county. The priest consented with reluctance, and the young people were made happy. Some months after he visited his young friend, and finding a convenient opportunity, he told her with horror in his looks, that she was pregnant of a monster. The woman was terrified, and such was her superstitious confidence in her guide, notwithstanding his former attempts upon her, that she believed his assertion; and it was not till he had made an infamous proposal, as a remedy for the evil, that she told the matter to her husband, who cudgelled the brute out of his house."

The following is from another correspondent:—

Extract from the translation of Sleidane's Commentaries, translated by Jhon Dans, 1560, imprinted at London by Jhon Daye, for Abraham Veal and Nicholas England, 1560, 25th of September, L III. fol. xxxv. xxxvi. "In many of theyr Townes it is the maner, that when they receive a newe minister of the church, they bidde him take a lemane, lest he attempt to defyle honest women, whiche custome although it be laughed at of many, yet it was wittelye diuised as the tyme serued, and in so greate wickedness of doctrine depraved."



a former letter from this gentleman, and my reasons for doing so. This is the avowed cause of his displeasure, although it is difficult to understand why he should have taken it so much amiss. I suppose he is the first that ever supposed that a periodical writer is obliged to print all that every man chooses to address to him, whether it be to the purpose or not.

“ SIR,

“ I HAD not an opportunity of seeing your method of noticing my last letter to you till very lately. You have, I see, taken the method of all those who, wishing to throw things unfavourable to their system into the back ground, represent only those features of the picture which are most for their advantage. It was a mean, cowardly artifice in you, not to give the public a full view of the arguments of your opponent, by presenting them with a faithful complete copy of his letter, and allowing them, without any fear of the consequences, to judge for themselves. I am aware, however, that some things were contained in that production, which it did not suit your purpose to give to public view. I must tell you, however, that I will permit no man to make free with altering my letters, or with giving a summary of their contents, but myself; more especially one whose interest it is that they should appear in a mutilated and distorted form. When you shall have given the public a *bona fide* transcript of my letter, I will proceed to reply to your answers to my queries, to refute some of your calumnious, ill-natured, ill-mannered, misrepresentations of Popery, and put some more queries to you. If you refuse to do that piece of justice, I will write no more to you on the subject, but after having made the public acquainted with the reasons of my silence, I will treat your arguments and production in the way they ought to have been all along treated; and which, in less than half a century, they will be treated with contempt.

A FRIEND TO FAIR DEALING.”

Now, in the first place, I wish this gentleman to understand, that I do not look upon *even his* correspondence as of so much value, that I will do an unreasonable thing to induce him to continue it; and that I consider his not writing to me any more as a matter of no very great importance. As I have the sole responsibility, I must be the sole judge of what is fit to appear in my pages. I have always felt reluctant to make my readers pay for extraneous and irrelevant matter; and, to avoid this, when at one time I was led into such matter, I gave the quantity of a whole Number *gratis*. (See No. L.) But I cannot afford to do the same with all that others may write. I suppose the feelings of my correspondent are not very acute on this score, as he has made

me pay three postages of nine-pence half-penny each, which a little discretion would have taught him, ought to have been paid by himself. Indeed all my Popish correspondents, whose letters came through the post office, are in the like fault, except one Glasgow one, whose discretion cost him only a penny. This is not a matter which I think worth complaining of as a hardship, but it is worth mentioning as a trait in the character of our Papists, and it stands in bold contrast with that of Protestants, for though their letters to me have been twenty; perhaps fifty times more in number, few of them cost me any thing.

This friend to fair dealing gravely and authoritatively tells me, that he will *permit* no man, but himself, to do so and so with his letters: and I hereby assure him, that I will *permit* no man to dictate to me what I shall do with a letter, addressed to me, and for which I have paid ten times its value. I admit, at the same time, that he would have had cause to find fault, if I had given as his words, what were not his; or if I had given only detached scraps of his letter, separated from their connexion, so as to misrepresent or conceal his meaning. But nothing of this kind have I done with his writing, or that of any other opponent. What I gave was a *bona fide* extract, containing an entire whole within itself, without the least dependence, for the understanding of its meaning; upon any other sentence in the sheet; so that I did not "alter" a single word, or even syllable, as he would insinuate when he says he will permit no man to do so but himself. He will not, he says, even permit any other man to give a summary of the contents of his letters; but how he is able to prevent this, I cannot divine, unless he shall keep them all carefully locked up in his secretaire.

This precious letter of his appears in his own esteem to be so weighty, that it did not suit my purpose to give it to public view. That is, I suppose, his arguments were so powerful, that I could not answer them, and feeling conscious of this, I had recourse to the "mean and cowardly artifice" of keeping them out of sight. I am perfectly willing thus to give his accusation in the plainest and broadest form; and I cheerfully meet it, by challenging him to publish his entire production to the world. It may be contained in a half sheet, about the size of one of my numbers, and may be sold at the same price. If he has not retained a copy, I will deliver an exact transcript of the original to any printer whom he may authorise to receive it.

This undertaking of course ought to be at his own risk; but lest he should have before his eyes the melancholy fate of the Catholic Vindicator, whose numbers might have been bought for twopence per pound weight, as one of the retailers of it told in his public shop; I hereby promise to give it all the publicity

that an advertisement in my Work can give. I make this offer from a real desire that the public may see what he considers so formidable, and for my own justification in declining to insert the whole letter,—every clause of which it would be easy to answer; but in answering it, I would be led many degrees away from my controversy with the Church of Rome, in order to give the history, and discuss the merits of the Glasgow Church Bill; and other matters equally irrelevant, for which see a more particular account in my summary of the letter in my XCV. Number.

If it shall be asked, why not gratify him at once by printing it entire? I answer again, that I did not at first think it right to tax the purses and the patience of my readers, by presenting them with such a great mass of useless words; and though my determination on this point might have been altered by a respectful request, I am not disposed to be influenced to change my opinion, or my procedure, by an “ill-natured,” and “ill-mannered” threat. Besides, it appears that this “friend to fair dealing,” sees my Work only occasionally. My extract and remarks on his former letter, were published on the 6th of May; and, in September, he writes, that he had not seen them till very lately, from which I infer that he is not a subscriber. He has no right, therefore, to demand insertion of his letter, and to make others pay for what he does not pay for himself. And, farther, it appears that he has not read the whole of my work, else he would find that I have answered, at least in part, what he calls upon me to answer again.

After all, I suspect that my correspondent has merely made a pretext for the purpose of securing what he will conceive to be an honourable retreat, and so to get quit of a controversy which he dreads entering farther into; seeing he cannot get me to enter the lists with him on subjects quite unconnected with the Popish errors which I am exposing. Why does he not reply to what I have written on transubstantiation, and purgatory, and auricular confession, and the worship of creatures, and those other points which affect the vitals of the system? The reason is, he does not choose to commit himself, in a country so enlightened as Scotland, by avowing the real doctrine of Rome on such points; and he dares not deny them, else he might suffer the censure of his superiors, and even canonical deprivation, if he be, as I suppose, a priest. Like other writers of his communion, therefore, he catches at some casual expressions, which are of about as much importance in relation to the controversy, as the vane of a kirk steeple is to the doctrine of the church; and because he cannot prevail upon me to waste my time, and exhaust the patience of my readers, by discussing such trifles, he cries out about my meanness and cowardice; and ventures gravely to predict, that in less than half a century, my



arguments will be treated with contempt. I thank him for giving me so long a lease of the good opinion with which I have the honour to be regarded by the public; and I wish he may live to renew the grant, in case it shall turn out that he is not a true prophet.

Now, if he were to honour me with another letter, the last sentence will furnish him with matter for a very long one. He would probably ask a dozen questions about the nature of leases, and upon what premises I made the conclusion that he had granted me one for fifty years? what was the criterion of public opinion? from what circumstance I inferred the probability of his living fifty years? and how was a false prophet to be known from a true one? This will appear very ridiculous; but it is precisely the manner in which this correspondent writes away from the subject, and attempts to draw me away from it.

I insert the following letter, not because I intend to enter at present upon the subject of "Catholic emancipation," but because it proves that certain facts and features of the character of Popery, which I have been honoured to bring to view, have altered the opinion of some, and I believe not a few, on that very important subject.

#### " TO THE PROTESTANT.

*" Glasgow, September 11th, 1820.*

" SIR,—I am a protestant dissenter, and a hearty friend to religious liberty, as I understand it. I have been for thirty years a friend also to Catholic emancipation in Ireland, and sincerely hoped it would be attained. However, from the recent conduct of the heads of the Popish church, I begin to doubt if this object be desirable. The Popish clergy are now exhibiting themselves in an attitude the most hostile to religious liberty. Common sense would say that no person has a right to molest or interrupt another in the exercise of religion, and in obeying his conscience. But if a person's conscience shall dictate to him that he is to violate the person, or property, or civil good name of others; or to debar them from the peaceable exercise of their industry, or of their religion, and if he shall call this religion—in a word, if he *do to others*, in those matters, what he would reckon an outrage if done to himself or his friends, he must be *restrained*. He, and his conscience, and his religion, must be all shut up in some bedlam or prison, or put into safe custody of some sort, which will prevent violent aggressions on others, and tumults in society.

" If Popery be indeed what it is represented to be by the titular Archbishop of Dublin, in his letter inserted in No. CXIII. of

the Protestant, it is obviously a religion which requires restraint, and cannot safely be allowed to go at large.—On Sunday, August 2d, 1819, a school in Samson's Lane, Moore Street, Dublin, was peaceably employed in the usual exercises of teaching, and learning to read the Bible, when a Popish priest entered, interrupted the business, forced the books out of the hands of several of the children, and forced the children out of the school.—Now surely this conduct of this priest was highly outrageous. He had a right, which no person could justly forbid, to persuade parents not to send their children to such schools. No person had any right to hinder him from visiting all the parents who submitted to his authority, at their homes, and there charging them not to suffer their children to attend such schools, or to recall them instantly. In such visitations, none might prohibit him from using all his influence with parents and children, in support of such charges and commands. Nay, he might publicly denounce in his own chapel, all such schools, and curse, if he pleased, three times a day all such schools, teachers, scholars, and all who should give them any countenance. But to go into another man's school-house, to interrupt the exercises, to seize the books, and to force away the pupils, was conduct to be restrained by the police.

“If this conduct is permitted with impunity, then, as often as a Popish priest thinks any of the young folks of his congregation are attending a parish church, or a dissenting meeting, he has a right to enter, to interrupt the public exercises, to force the Bibles, prayer-books, and hymn-books, out of the people's hands, and to drive such as he calls Catholics out of the place. If he cannot do this single handed, he has a right to employ help. Nay, if such conduct is permitted, it will be equally right to make similar invasions on Popish chapels, as often as professed Protestants are suspected of being present. Every man must see how insufferable and destructive of peace such conduct would be.—Yet, in the judgment of the Archbishop of Dublin, (from his residence the most important Popish authority in Ireland) the conduct of this priest was right, and exhibited a true practical view of Popery.

“He writes:—‘Conformably to these maxims, and to the *uniform discipline of the Catholic church*, Rev. Mr. S. went to your school to withdraw the Catholic children from it, at the very time when religious and moral instruction were given, particularly to children, in Liffey Street parish chapel. He cannot, on this account, be justly accused of opposition to the constituted authorities, which allow the free exercise of the Catholic religion, and the authority of its ministers to instruct the ignorant of their communion.’

"If such conduct be conformable to the 'uniform' discipline of the Popish church, and if liberty to act so be what Popish priests and others are urging after as the *free exercise of their religion*, it is obvious that this *free exercise* is totally inconsistent with the *civil peace* of society.—When, allured by the novel charms of the organ, and of chanting in an unknown language; and by the glare of sacerdotal paraphernalia and trappings, many of the Presbyterians, and others of Glasgow, attended the Popish chapel in Clyde Street; how would Mr. S. and his adherents have felt if all the other pastors in the city had bolted in, interrupted the service, and driven away every one his own adherents, or attempted to drive them away. This would justly have been reckoned persecution; but it would have been a piece of conduct quite parallel to that which the Archbishop of Popery in Dublin calls the *free exercise* of the Catholic religion. Papists have a right, before men, to inculcate certain of their principles, by all means of moral suasion and religious motives; but such a right must be used by them '*salvo jure cujusque*,' reserving to all others a similar right. They have a right to consider their own tenets true, and the only true tenets; but they must leave, and magistrates must leave to others the right to think them false. These principles the Archbishop does not recognise. He blames Protestants for *inviting* Catholic children to their schools; but *he* would glory in proselyting others, children or adults. He would not treat others as he would be treated, but would urge on others the paramount authority of his church.—Yours,

AN IRISHMAN."

W. D. has favoured me with another letter, a great deal longer than either of his former ones; and has put me to the expense of double postage. I request him to publish it in a separate pamphlet, and I shall answer it when I come to treat the question, How we know the Bible to be the word of God, independently of the authority of the Church of Rome? In my reply to his last, I called upon him to inform me from what pulpits he had heard the doctrine asserted, that God revealed one religion to one country, and a contrary one to another, which he said he had "often heard from men of good education, even from the pulpits;" and the following is his answer:—"Well, Sir, I shall do more than you require, to convince you of what I said. If you take the trouble to go into the Presbyterian church of Scotland, you may depend upon it that the reverend minister will tell you, that his is one of the true religion; next be pleased to step into the Episcopal church of England, and you may rely upon it you will hear the same," &c. &c. In this manner W. D. makes a tour of a number of sects; and because every one maintains the truth of its own distinguishing peculiarity, he asserts that he hears from their pulpits, that *God has revealed one religion to one people, and a contrary one to another!* A man who can shuffle in this manner, has no right to expect that I shall hereafter respect his communications as I have done.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXIX.

---

SATURDAY, OCTOBER, 21st, 1820.

---

THE following letter is written in a better spirit than most of those which I have received from adherents of the Church of Rome. It has, besides, the advantage of having a defined object ; and that object is one of the principal points of the controversy. Therefore, though it be very long, as the writer himself acknowledges, I shall give it entire :—

“ TO THE PROTESTANT.

4th July, 1820.

“ SIR,

“ Being a reader of your papers, and at present a member of that church, against which they are directed, I have at times thought of laying before you, some of the defences usually made by Catholics, in reply to their Protestant opponents, with my occasional remarks ; in order that I might request the favour of your opinion upon them, as they might not be within the plan which you have adopted, but which you may perhaps have no objections to notice for the instruction of one, who, according to your belief, is not at present in the right road : yet, he is one who is not inclined to remain with any particular church, if he see sufficient grounds for forsaking it.

“ Therefore, seeing you have lately commenced a subject, upon which, according to your correspondent J. C. the “ whole Popish system is built :” viz. “ on that supposed supremacy bestowed exclusively on Peter,” I have now ventured to trouble you with a few observations on this foundation of the papal system, with the hope, that if you think them worth your notice, you will with your convenience spare a page or two, for a few remarks thereon.

"In the first place, then, Christ promised to build his church upon a rock. Commenting on this, you say that this rock on which Christ promised to build his church, was not Peter, but himself:—on the other hand, St. Peter is, by Catholics and even by learned Protestants, said to be this rock; for that Christ, as a reward to Simon for the ardour of his love, strength of his faith, and the ready confession of his divinity, said to him, "Thou art Peter, (that is, thou art a rock;) and upon this rock I will build my church." "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c. Here, under the metaphor of the keys, Catholics say, that Christ declares his making Peter the chief governor of his church; in the same way, as when the keys of a city are delivered to a man, he is made ruler or governor of that city. When "on the subject of the rock, in giving your definition of the Greek noun *Petros*, you say it signifies a stone," viz. "such a stone as we can handle, move, or turn over," and that Christ, in giving him that name, meant to signify his *mobility* or fickleness. Now, from what I can see from the Greek Lexicons, which are commonly used in our Protestant schools, it seems to me that *Petros* could as easily be rendered English, a *rock*, as a *stone*, and much easier than that of "a loose moveable stone," as your Number has it. So that I must still consider Peter to be the rock on which the church was to be built, until I see a reasonable account why this name was conferred upon him. As for your saying that it was to signify his versatility, it seems to me rather paradoxical; for "when names were given to men as recorded in Scripture, whether compounded or not with the names of animals or inanimate things, it was done in allusion to the natures and qualities of these animals or things." (PROTESTANT, No. XCIX.) This I consider to be perfectly applicable: so that Christ, in giving to Simon the name of Peter or rock, thereby signified the firmness of his faith, and the eminent station he was to hold.

"In No. C. you say, "it is the avowed doctrine of St. Augustine, one of Rome's greatest oracles, that Christ did not promise to build his church upon Peter, but upon himself, the rock which Peter had confessed." In opposition to the quotation you make from St. Augustine, I will lay one before you from that Divine's Psalm against the Donatists: in it he says, "reckon up the prelates in the very see of Peter, and in that order of fathers, see which has succeeded him. *This is the rock* over which the proud gates of hell prevail not." These words carry with them a very different meaning from what you give, as the avowed doctrine of this father. And one of his cotemporaries, in writing on this subject, uses words that plainer cannot be, to show the belief of the age in which they lived. "Christ predicts, that not Simon, but Peter shall be his name; by the word opportunely, signifying, that *on him*, as on a *firm rock*, he was about to build his church." *St. Cyril of Alex. L. II. in Joan. c. 12th.* Thus far the opinion of the

fathers of the beginning of the fifth century, to which you refer let us, however, see what those of a still older date say upon this subject, as their testimony must have still greater weight. In the third century we find Origen saying, "consider what was said by the Lord, to that great foundation of the church, and that most firm rock, on which Christ built his church, *O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?* Matt. xiv. 31." *Hom. V. in Exod.* About the same time St. Cyprian writes, "For the Lord in the first place gave to Peter, on whom he built his church," &c. *Ep. lxxiii.* Again, "Peter whom the Lord chose the first, and on whom he built his church," &c. *Ep. lxxi.* In the fourth century St. Gregory of Nazianzen writes, "You see how Peter, among the disciples of Christ, all great, and all worthy of choice, is called a rock, and receives, on the profession of his faith, the foundations of the church; while John is particularly beloved, and rests on the breast of Christ; and the other disciples bear this preference without repining." *Orat. XXVI.* "The memory of Peter, the head of the apostles, is celebrated, and with him, that of the other members of the church. But the church of God is firmly built on him. For he, according to the prerogative granted to him by the Lord, is that firm and solid rock upon which the Saviour built his church." *St. Gregory of Nyssa, Orat. II.* Add to these St. Chrysostom, St. Epiphanius, St. Basil, &c. who all use words equally strong with those above noticed.

"In addition to these venerable names, I will now bring forward one or two respectable Protestant writers in favour of this subject; for example, Whitaker writes, "We do not deny Peter to have been the foundation and the governor of the church, neither shall we at all hesitate (if required) to acknowledge its having been promised to him in the words," &c. *Whit. Cont. 4. q. 2. ch. 2d.* In another place he says, "Who doth not confess that Peter is the rock and foundation of the church?" *Contra Durcum, L. V. Sect. 4th.* To Whitaker's declarations, join those of a celebrated dignitary of the English church in the present age; viz. the celebrated Dr. Marsh; a writer whose Anti-Catholic principles are well known. Yet he, in his "Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome," p. 213, (in which work he wishes to show that the conduct of the Church of Rome, is in general repugnant to the inspired Word of God;) has candidly shown that the words 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church,' must mean "Thou art *rock by name*, and shall be rock indeed; for on thee," &c. When noticing those who hold a contrary opinion, he says, they "have taken such unsuccessful pains to show, that our Saviour, under the word rock, did not understand St. Peter."

"It was my intention that this letter should have been principally occupied by the subject of the supremacy; but that of the rock



has filled more of my paper than I expected, so that I must confine myself chiefly to what you advance in regard to St. Augustine.

"You say "It must be admitted this Divine was not a thoroughbred Papist. It was some ages after his time, that the man of sin came to maturity, or that the Pope was declared Universal Bishop. Augustine was not fully initiated in the doctrine of Peter's supremacy"—PROT. No. C. p. 393. With regard to these points, I am at present of a different opinion. In the first place, I find Pope Victor so early as the second century exercising his power as Universal Bishop, when he threatened to excommunicate the Bishops of Asia Minor, for keeping Easter at an undue time; and none of them charged him with usurping a power which did not belong to him.—Euseb. L. V. Hist. Eccles. c. 24. In the third century St. Cyprian, Ep. 67. wrote to Pope Stephen, desiring him to despatch his letters into the province and to the people of Arles, by which they might be authorised to depose Marcianus the Bishop of Arles, and substitute another in his place. In the fourth century, Pope Julius cited St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, the second patriarch of the church, to his council at Rome, to answer the accusations of his adversaries; he accordingly did appear and was there cleared.—*Vide St. Athan. Apol. ag. the Arians.* The same Pope, about the same time, restored, by his authority, to their respective sees, whence they had been deposed by the Eusebians, St. Paul, Bishop of Constantinople, St. Lucius of Adrianople, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepas of Gaza, in Palestine; and this he did, says Sozomenus, "because, by reason of the dignity of his see, the care of all belonged to him."—L. III. c. 8. And about the time of St. Augustine, Pope Celestine, deputed St. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, to proceed as his delegate to the excommunication of Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople.—*Tom. III. Concil. Iabbe, p. 349.* From these historical facts, we see the Pope acknowledged Universal Bishop for ages before St. Augustine; and if I had room, the proofs could easily be carried up to the beginning of the seventh century, at which time some Protestants pretend the Pope received his supremacy from Phocas, Emperor of Constantinople, who began his reign, anno 602.

"Now, for a few words, whether or not St. Augustine was "fully initiated" in the doctrine of the supremacy? You say he was not; but, from the following extracts, I am inclined to think he was. In his work, *De Donat. Dysidis*, he says, "If we are to consider the series of Episcopal successions, with how much greater certainty we number from Peter, to *whom, as representing the whole church*, Christ said, On this rock I will build my church. To Peter succeeded Linus," &c. In another place, "For who can be ignorant, that the most blessed Peter is the first of the apostles?" *In*

*Evang. Joan.* "Peter among the apostles, the first, the most ardent in his love of Christ, often answered for the rest." Sermon. xiii. And again, "The apostle Peter, on account of the *primacy of his apostleship*, represented the church; as to himself by nature he was one man, by grace, a Christian; but, by a more abundant grace, the first apostle."—*In Evang. Joan.* To reconcile these extracts from the works of St. Augustine, with what you say in regard to that father, I am quite unable; for here, by the expressions he makes use of, he seems most "fully initiated" in the belief of the supremacy. In the most explicit terms, he repeatedly calls him *the first* of the apostles; and in the last quotation, he uses words, that plainer cannot be to show his belief in the superiority of Peter, viz. that by reason of his primacy he represented the church. The supremacy of St. Peter, and his successors, is not only clearly laid down by Eusebius, S. S. Leo, Cyrils, Gregories, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerom, &c. about the time of St. Augustine, but also by Origen, and St. Cyprian, of the third century; Tertullian and Irenæus of the second, all of whom agree in styling Peter the head and pillar of the church; and the bishops of Rome his successors.

"The purity of the church, for the first five centuries, is acknowledged by the most learned Protestants, which is the reason that I have given in this letter so many of the testimonies of the writers of those times. The famous Jewel, in his answer to Harding, writes: "St. Augustine, and the other godly fathers, *rightly* yielded reverence to the see of Rome, for the purity of religion there preserved a long time without spot. The godly fathers of those times, seeking to the Church of Rome then for *purity* of religion, most famous above all others," p. 246. And Whitaker, in his work on Antichrist, says: "During the first 500 years, the church was pure, and inviolably taught the faith delivered by the apostles," p. 31.

"In one of your late Numbers, you say that you bring the authority of the fathers against the Catholics, when you think their opinion is in your favour, as it must have great weight with them on their own principles; yet, when the fathers are in favour of the Catholics, you add, you care no more for their opinion than for that of any divine of the present age. But, when I consider that a number of important passages in the New Testament, are subject to so many various and contradictory interpretations, by what means are we to come to the knowledge of the true meaning of those passages, if it be not by a reference to the writings of those eminent men who flourished in the apostolic age, or those ages immediately succeeding; for they certainly had every opportunity of knowing the belief and practice of the apos-

bles, which, without doubt, would be carefully preserved and handed down from age to age by the Christian churches. So that, on account of the times and circumstances in which they were placed, the fathers had surely a better opportunity of knowing the true meaning of the inspired writings than any divine of the present age can pretend to. But you may perhaps give in answer, what you said in one of your Numbers some time ago. viz. that as the writings of the fathers were, for so many ages, only in the hands of the Papists, they could make such interpretations in them as they thought necessary to answer their own purposes. If that were the case, how did it come to pass, that they were so inconsiderate as not to alter the more important part, viz. the New Testament, in such a manner, as that it would have been more explicit on those disputed points upon which the fathers are so clear. Certainly they had the one in their power as much as the other. If it be said, they did make such alterations in the New Testament, where then did the Reformers at first get a copy for the instruction of their followers?

“ Before finishing, I beg leave to say a few words on the supremacy in general.

“ When, to show that St. Peter had no superiority, you bring forward St. Paul, in 2 Corinthians ch. xii. 11th, saying, that he was equal with the very chiefest of the apostles; in answer, is not the apostle here speaking in regard to his labours, miracles, &c. in which, without doubt, he was inferior to none?

“ You say, that if St. Peter were the head of the apostles, how did St. Paul come to withstand him to his face at Antioch? The apostle, in the same place, tells us the reason—because he was to *blame*. And no one doubts, but that a superior, when in fault, may sometimes be lawfully reprehended by an inferior. St. Cyprian, writing on this subject, says, in his 71st Epistle, ‘ Nor did Peter, whom the Lord chose the first, and on whom he built his church, when afterwards he disagreed with Paul concerning circumcision, arrogate any thing to himself, saying, that he held the primacy, and that he ought to be obeyed by those who came after him. He despised not Paul because he had persecuted the church, but listened to the advice of truth, and assented to reason.’

“ In short, that St. Peter was chief of the apostles, see satisfactory proofs in the Bishop of Lincoln’s Elements of Christian Theology, vol. i. part second, xxv. p. 476,—an author whom no person can accuse of being a friend to the Catholic cause.

“ In conclusion, I must apologize for the length to which I have carried my Letter, but I expect you will pardon the first offence against good breeding. So I finish with the hope, that you will



excuse any inaccuracy of expression in one of the first attempts of

“Your humble servant,

“JUVENIS.”

Instead of making a particular reply to all the matters contained in the above, I request my readers, to revert to what has been already said on the subject of Peter's supremacy, and that of the Pope, in *THE PROTESTANT*, No. XCIX. to CIV., inclusive. Juvenis manages his argument with more skill than I would expect from a mere youth; and yet he has not succeeded in proving that any one of my facts is doubtful, or any one of my arguments erroneous or inconclusive. The foundation on which such a fabric as the papal supremacy is built, ought surely to be very solid; but nothing that Juvenis has alleged, tends to invest it with this character.

He makes a fundamental mistake in the very outset, which vitiates the whole of his first argument. “In the first place,” says he, “Christ promised to build his church upon *a* rock.” Now, there is no such promise in the New Testament. The mere English reader may see, that these are not Christ's words; but he who understands Greek, will perceive, in a much stronger light, that the above is not Christ's meaning. The original words, *ταύτην τῇ πέτρᾳ*, are properly rendered by my correspondent, J. C. *This THE rock*. Allowing that the word *πέτρος* may signify rock, as well as stone, it points to no particular object; but the phrase, *this the rock*, points to a definite object, already known and acknowledged as the Rock of Israel. But after all, *Petros* was not the name which Christ gave to this apostle, but only a translation of it into Greek. Christ and his apostles spoke the language of the common people, which was the Syro-Chaldaic; and the name which Simon received was, in that language, *Cephas*, which the evangelists usually translated into Greek, the language in which they wrote the gospels. Our translators have, in general, retained the Greek word in an English form; but, in one instance, when they had the word *Cephas* itself to translate, they gave it the true English rendering:—“Thou art Simon, the son of Jonah; thou shalt be called *Cephas*, which is, by interpretation, *a stone*.” John i. 42. Whether it be a moveable stone or not, it is merely *a* stone; or, even allowing the word to be translated in favour of my opponent, it is merely *a* rock, and cannot be *the* Rock on which the church is built, any more than *a* god among the gods many, can be *the* living and true God. My correspondent is equally unfortunate in his reference to the Greek Lexicons commonly used in our schools. These are chiefly Greek and Latin; and they do not profess to give the English of any Greek word;

but there are two valuable Greek and English Lexicons, by means of which, a knowledge of the original language of the New Testament may be acquired without the intervention of Latin. These are the works of Ewing and Parkhurst. The former renders the word *πετρος*, a large stone, a piece, or fragment of a rock. The latter says "Homer uses it constantly, I believe, for a large stone, i. e. a piece or fragment of a rock, but such as a strong man might throw."

I repeat, that with regard to any point of doctrine, or the meaning of any text of Scripture, St. Augustine is no greater authority than any other divine of ancient or modern times. I cited him to establish the fact, that the ancient fathers were not agreed about Peter's supremacy; and all that Juvenis cites from his other works, goes only to prove this other fact, that he was not agreed with himself; but wrote different, and even opposite sentiments, at different periods of his life. I make this remark upon the supposition, that what Juvenis quotes, are really the words of Augustine; though if he, or the authors from whom he quotes, refer to the editions that have undergone the expurgatory process of the index, he cannot be sure whether they are his words or not. All the other fathers whom he cites are liable to the same objection; but though it were otherwise, I account them of no authority whatever, in support of a system of religion, which ought to rest on nothing less than divine authority. Thus the second argument of my correspondent falls to the ground like its predecessor, because it was built upon a foundation too weak to bear the weight of one article of faith, or one ordinance of worship; much less could it bear the weight of a whole system, like that of Popery, which professes to influence heaven, and earth, and hell.

As for the respectable Protestant divines who have conceded to the Church of Rome, that Peter is the rock on which Christ built his church, I have nothing to do with them, but to marvel at their inconsistency. As a Protestant, I claim the privilege of thinking for myself, and am not to be influenced by great names, to adopt a sentiment which appears to me inconsistent with the Word of God, and with those promises, in particular, which assure the absolute security of the church, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, whereas the enemy prevailed against Peter, once and again; and if the church has no more solid foundation than a mere creature, we cannot be sure of her stability for an hour.

*(Farther remarks in my next.)*

THE

# Protestant,

No. CXX.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28th, 1820.  
~~~~~

I HAD asserted, that St. Augustine was not a thorough-bred Papist; that it was some ages after his time that the man of sin came to maturity, or that the Pope was declared universal bishop: and that Augustine was not fully initiated in the doctrine of Peter's supremacy. I assert the same still; and every reader of church history knows it to be the fact, that the title of universal bishop was not conceded to the Pope of Rome for a long time after Augustine's death; and Gregory the Great declared, that the man who should assume that title, was the forerunner of Antichrist in his pride. (See PROT. No. CIV.) This is not like one of those doubtful matters about which historians grope in the dark, without being able to come to a satisfactory conclusion. It is as clearly recorded as any thing of the kind can be. And what does my correspondent oppose to the well known fact? Nothing, but that he is "*at present* of a different opinion." Then, as the ground on which he forms his opinion, he refers to certain Popes claiming universal jurisdiction, long before the time of Augustine, and he mentions an instance of an individual submitting to the claim, and, therefore, the Popes are said to have exercised the power of universal bishops. We know that the claim was made by certain individual bishops of high ambition, and was rejected with abhorrence, by some churches in the east, long before the Pope of Rome was formally invested with it. That he claimed this high title, and professed to exercise universal jurisdiction at an earlier period, is no evidence that his title was acknowledged. It is but two years since a Popish priest in Glasgow, after the solemn farce of high mass, before an immense con-



gregation of Protestants, who had gone to witness the ceremony, claimed the right, and exercised the power, of denouncing, from the pulpit, the writer of these pages, and of virtually, if not actually excommunicating him. This holy father claimed, and even professed to exercise, a power and jurisdiction over my soul and body; but it does not follow, that he had a legal right to such power, or was acknowledged to possess it. No more does the claim of Pope Victor, and other early demagogues, over other churches beside their own, prove that they had a good title to exercise such power, or that it was generally conceded.

Juvenis tells me, that "the purity of the church of Rome for the first five centuries, is acknowledged by the most learned Protestants." Before I concede this point, I must be informed what it is, that, in the opinion of these Protestants, constitutes church purity. I am sure that I could point out many impure things in that church, before the expiry of the fifth century; and yet I am willing to concede, that until that period she was *comparatively* pure. She was not then defiled by the absurdity of transubstantiation, and the idolatry of the mass; nor was the worship of images then generally practised; nor were the clergy then forbidden to marry; nor was it then allowed to them to keep concubines; and there are fifty other abominable things which were not then countenanced, but which sprung up in the dark ages that followed, and are now so essentially incorporated with the system that they cannot be separated from it. But what does my correspondent gain by asserting the purity of his church for 500 years? This is a tacit admission that she has been impure for more than double the time, seeing he has not a word to say in her behalf since the end of the fifth century. It would be rather an ungracious way of complimenting an old man, to say, that the first twenty years of his life were spent virtuously, but as for the subsequent part, the less that is said, the better. Now, it is chiefly the present state of a church, with which its members have to do. I advise Juvenis, therefore, not to satisfy himself with the notion, that his church was pure thirteen hundred years ago, seeing her more recent history presents her in a light so extremely bloated with every species of impurity; and seeing he professes himself not inclined to continue within her pale, if he sees sufficient ground for forsaking it; I request him to pay attention to his Bible, and follow where he shall find it to lead, leaving the works of fathers and saints of the church to the worms and the moths, who will digest them with much more advantage to themselves, than he will ever be able to do.

My correspondent inquires why his church may not have corrupted the text of the Bible, seeing they had it in their hands, as

well as the writings of the fathers, which they are said to have corrupted? To this it may be replied, that the Church of Rome was not the sole depository of the Word of God, else we cannot say what liberties she might have taken with it. We know that the Old Testament has been carefully preserved by the Jews; and we know that the New Testament was received by many churches in the east, over which the Church of Rome could never prevail; and by them has been preserved to this day; so that it was not possible for Papists to make any material alteration in the Divine Word, without exposing themselves to detection. This, however, is a subject which requires more particular discussion; and I will have an opportunity of entering fully into it, when I come to reply to Mr. Andrews.

When I find the authority of ancient fathers against the present doctrine of Papists, I consider it perfectly fair to adduce it, because it is an authority which they acknowledge, and to which, upon their own principles, they ought to submit; but when such authority is brought against the Protestant doctrine, I am not obliged to submit to it, for I never acknowledged it. I will give all due respect to the fathers, as witnesses of matters of fact which came within their own knowledge, so far as they give a consistent testimony; but when they appear as expounders of the Divine Word, I consider them in no higher light than the present Rector of Aston Sandford, or the late Independent Minister in Chester, or any other parish priest, or dissenting minister, who may write a commentary on the Scriptures. I have here in my eye certain works of great value, but they are human compositions; and no man ought to trust them implicitly, in their exposition of any text, but ought to judge for himself, as he must give account for himself, at the great day.

Juvenis has fallen into a great mistake, and I believe it is a prevalent one with persons of his communion, and perhaps with some others; namely, that the fathers who lived near the apostolic age, had better opportunities of knowing the meaning of what the apostles taught, than persons who are alive at this day. This might have been true, if the apostles had trusted the communication of what they taught to oral tradition; but seeing they put their instructions in writing, any man who understands the writing, though he should live at the distance of two thousand years, is as capable of understanding the instructions, as if he had heard them with his ears, from the lips of the inspired teachers. The Greek is a language remarkable for its precision, as well as its copiousness. Perhaps there is no language more capable of expressing every thing that the human tongue can express, and the human mind apprehend; and from the multitude of books which were written in it, while it was the language of the polite and learned world, it is easy for a diligent student to acquire such a knowledge

of every word and phrase, that he shall find little difficulty in translating, into his native tongue, the plain testimony of the apostles concerning Jesus of Nazareth, and the foundation on which he promised to build his church. And this plain testimony, expressed in English, is as capable of being understood by the reader of English, as by any saint or father of the second century.

Besides, we know from the apostolic writings, that erroneous sentiments began to prevail in the first century. Jewish converts had their Jewish prejudices, and heathen converts had theirs; and both had begun to mix up these prejudices with the articles of their Christian profession. Suppose, then, the doctrines which the apostles taught, had been communicated by the oral testimony of a Jewish, or of a heathen convert, and there was no other, they would almost necessarily have received a colouring, or bias, from the medium through which they passed. In this way, I doubt not, the early fathers of the church were led into many mistakes. In short, they had no security against error, but by having recourse to the *ipsissima verba*, the very words, which the apostles wrote; rejecting every oral traditionary gloss, as calculated to lead them astray, and taking the very words of the divine record in their simple grammatical sense. This is what we of the present day are as capable of doing as they were; and therefore we are not dependent on them for the understanding of the Word of God.

Before entering upon the subject of the Inquisition, I shall occupy a Number or two with a sketch of the doctrine and personal character of the Reformers; which will afford a relief to the religious mind, after the disgusting details which I was obliged to give of the wicked lives of the Romish priests, while discussing the subject of their constrained celibacy. I shall introduce the present subject with an extract from a letter by AMICUS VERITATIS, for which see THE PROTESTANT, Vol. I. part I. page 38. In one of my letters, in the Glasgow Chronicle, I had stated the Christian doctrine, that Christ's death was a sufficient satisfaction to divine justice; and that sinners are saved by what Christ has done, not by any thing that they can do. To this my opponent replied:—

“ Like Luther before him, with one dash of his pen, he (*i. e.* THE PROTESTANT) magnanimously abolishes the obligation of good works, and opens the gates of heaven to every man who can only boast the gift of an all-saving faith. This solifidian tenet, it must be acknowledged, with the Church of England, in her articles, is ‘a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.’ The restraints of religion are too unpleasant to the passions of men:



• 'Tis prudent to reform her into ease,  
 And put her in undress to make her please ;  
 A lively faith will bear aloft the mind,  
 And leave the luggage of good works behind.'

“ ‘ On this head,’ says a writer of the present day, ‘ we have undoubtedly great obligations to Luther. Our blessed Redeemer died for us, and still left the way to happiness strait and rugged ; the new apostle rushed to the arms of his faithful Catharine, and made it spacious and commodious. After Christ it was still so uninviting, that, as he declared, few would choose to walk in it : after Luther, it was cleared of the thorns of virtue, and might with ease be trodden by thousands. His disciples, however, have gradually learned to blush at the extravagance of their master : in the course of time they have silently abandoned his school, and have returned, on this point at least, nearer to the doctrine of Scripture and common sense. But the unnatural portrait which their great patriarch had drawn of Catholic doctrine, they still cherish with filial respect, and consider it as an invaluable legacy.’ ”

This precious piece of Popish buffoonery is given by *AMICUS VERITATIS*, partly as his own, and partly as an extract from “ a writer of the present day ; ” but there is not a word of it his own, except the first four : “ Like Luther before him.” His marks of quotation ought to have begun at, “ with one dash of his pen ; ” but he throws them a few lines lower, that he may have the credit of what he will reckon a clever sneer at the doctrine of the Church of England. His assertion consists of two falsehoods, which must be disposed of, before we proceed to any thing else. The first is, that by one stroke of my pen, I abolished the obligation of good works ; and the second is, that Luther did this before me. Now there is not a word of truth in this, either with regard to Luther, or myself. I intreat every Papist in the kingdom to read and study my pages, from the beginning ; and I challenge them all to point out a single sentence, that by fair construction, can be made to express, or even imply, that I abolish the obligation of good works ; or, that I have said any thing that tends, in the smallest degree, to derogate from their importance and value. I request the reader, however, to observe that I refer to my own words only, or such words as I quote from others with approbation ; for I am aware, that my pages contain many extracts from Popish writers, which do tend to set aside all obligation to good works ; especially in my quotations from Jesuits’ *Morals*, which go so far as to relieve men from the painful obligation of loving either God or man.

In speaking of the subject of indulgences, I had occasion to quote the words of the French Catechism, which are,—“ The mind of the church is, to grant indulgences only to those who

*attend to the duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice."*

On this ground I convicted the Church of Rome of not only indulging, but commanding, or making it a duty, to commit sin : And certainly, if it be true that Christ has satisfied divine justice, by the sacrifice of himself once for all, it must be a great sin, no less than rebellion against God, for any man to attempt to satisfy divine justice for himself ; for this is to set aside the satisfaction of Christ, as not sufficient, but as requiring, in order to its sufficiency, the satisfaction of the sinner himself. This is the avowed doctrine of Rome. By commanding sinners " to satisfy, on their part, divine justice," she virtually commands them not to rely on the satisfaction, or atonement of Christ, but upon their own doings and sufferings. This I showed to be, in direct opposition to the whole tenour of the gospel ; and to be, in fact, an authoritative injunction, requiring all men to reject the gospel, and the salvation which it reveals ; and to satisfy divine justice, and effect their own salvation, the best way they can. This I declare to be commanding men to commit sin ; for if it be the duty of all to submit to the righteousness of God, and renounce their own, as the words of the apostle clearly imply, (Rom. x. 3.) then it must be a high degree of wickedness for any man to trust in his own righteousness, and not submit to the righteousness of God.

This is the substance of what I taught in the Glasgow Chronicle, (*See vol. I. part I. page 19.*) and this is what AMICUS VERITATIS calls, " with one dash of my pen, abolishing the obligation of good works." It is enough for me to know, that the same objection was made to the same doctrine, when it was taught by the apostle Paul ; and it was made by the same description of persons,—men who did not like to submit to the righteousness of God, but who went about seeking to establish their own righteousness. " Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law ; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God. Therefore, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight ; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets ; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe ; for there is no difference : for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God : being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus : whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God ; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then ? It is excluded.

By what law? Of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God, who shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: Yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii. 19—31.

I have made this long quotation from the inspired writings, to show, that, upon the gospel plan, sinners believing in Christ, are justified without respect to any doings or merits of their own; that is, without their obedience to any law, either in the way of doing or suffering. This is a doctrine that has always startled sinners when proposed to them. It appears to them as making void the law of God; and the apostle, divinely inspired, anticipates their objection, and assures them that it does no such thing, but that it establishes the law.

"A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," are the express words of the Holy Spirit, speaking by his inspired messenger. This is what my opponent calls, with a sneer, "this solifidian (*i. e.* faith alone) tenet." I have no objection to the term; and I pity the sinner who can mock at what every sinner ought to receive with devout gratitude, as the best news that ever was proclaimed to our fallen race: and if it were not so, that a man is justified by faith, without regard to his own doings, no man ever could be justified at all; which is the same as to say, no man could ever be saved; and our whole race must lie for ever under the guilt and the punishment of sin; for no man ever did any good works which could entitle him to the pardon of his sins, or to his justification before God. "There is none righteous, no not one." "Every mouth must be stopped," on the plea of righteousness, "and the whole world become (be declared and acknowledged) guilty before God." Now for a guilty rebel against the Lord of all, to do any thing worthy of having his guilt removed, and his person justified, is contrary to the whole tenour of Scripture, and even to the dictates of enlightened reason. No man could think of it, without the most unworthy and degrading notions of the law of God, and of God himself.

But the gospel doctrine of justification by faith, through the divine righteousness, that is, the obedience and death of Christ, *establishes the law*. It even magnifies the law, and makes it appear honourable. And certainly the divine law is more likely to be obeyed by him who has high and honourable views of it, than by him who thinks meanly of it. No man ever thought highly enough of the holy law of God, or even thought rightly of it at all, until he understood how it was fulfilled and magnified by the obedience to death of the Son of God. He who really under-



stands this as it is revealed in the Bible, is the most deeply impressed with the obligation of good works; not to procure his justification, but to manifest his justification; and he only will really do good works; for, believing in Christ he receives the new principle of spiritual life, from which alone works good and acceptable to God can proceed; he is created anew after Christ Jesus unto good works.

These things are familiar to every man whose religion is taken from the Bible. But it is impossible to make a Papist, or a self-righteous Protestant, understand them. They cannot imagine what good works are good for, unless it be to procure, or aid in procuring their justification. The CATHOLIC VINDICATOR avows this very plainly, though I do not recollect his precise words; and to seek for them in such a mass of confusion as his volume is, would be like searching for a needle in a hay-stack. It will sometimes be found, that the less that people understand of the matter, and the less of good works they exhibit in their own practice, the more noisy are they in pleading the merit of them. Nay, as a living writer has observed, there are some who will swear mightily on behalf of good works, and curse as hypocrites those who really do them, because they disavow all merit in them, and hope for salvation solely by faith in Christ. AMICUS VERITATIS, and the author whose words he uses, have not gone the length of swearing against the solifidian doctrine; but they show their spite against it as much as if they had; and that too, under a professed regard for good works; while, in fact, the doctrine of justification by faith without works, is the only root from which good works ever did, or ever will spring, among the race of Adam.

From this, I hope, it will appear to every one who understands the Bible, that I have not, by one dash of my pen, abolished the obligation of good works. In the above vindication of my sentiments on this subject, I may have repeated something that I have written before; but it is a subject that will bear repetition; and of which no Christian will become weary.

A correspondent has favoured me with an extract from Augustine's "Retractions," a work which he published in the latter part of his life; in which, among other things, he retracts his former opinion, that Peter was the rock on which Christ built his church. The same correspondent gives extracts from the principal Greek and Latin Lexicons used in our schools, with regard to the meaning of *πῆτρος*, and its compounds, which confirm what I gave in my last Number. For instance, *πῆτροβολος*, a thrower of stones; would Juvenis translate it, a thrower of rocks? *πῆτρος*, in the verbal form, *to stone*, would he translate it, *to rock*? There are some other curious examples of the strange work that such a mode of translating would make, for which I am sorry I have not room.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXI.

---

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4th, 1820.

---

(Continued from Number CXX.)

IT is time now to inquire into the truth of the assertion, that Luther before me, by one dash of his pen, abolished the obligation of good works. I shall give a more complete view of this charge, by quoting a little more of the author from whom AMICUS VERITATIS, in his zeal for good works, *stole* the words which he gave as his own :—"When the magnanimous fathers of the Reformation," says this writer, "separated from the Church of Rome, one object which engaged much of their attention was to justify or palliate their schism. For this purpose, every species of expedient was adopted; and among the Catholic doctrines, which they misrepresented and vilified, was that which teaches the utility and necessity of good works. The piety of Luther urged him to retire as far as possible from the corruptions of Babylon. With one dash of his pen, he magnanimously abolished the obligation of good works," &c. No. CXX. p. 124. *A Vindication of the Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham*, p. 39.

Those who are not acquainted with the writings of Papists can have no idea of the bare-faced impudence with which they can assert a falsehood, even knowing it to be such; for all the world knows, and this writer could not but know, that Luther's complaint against the Church of Rome, which led to his separation from it, was not her teaching the utility and necessity of good works; but because, by her infamous traffic in indulgences, she encouraged all manner of evil works. This is asserted by her own historians; and it is a fact as universally known as the fact of the Reformation itself; so that the writer could not but know it: and if his zeal for good works has not led him to curse and

~~swear~~ on their behalf, it has led him to tell a lie, knowing it to be such, for their sake.

It is, indeed, admitted, that, on this point, Luther taught the very same doctrine that THE PROTESTANT teaches; and it is nothing but what apostles and prophets, and Christ himself, taught before them,—that justification before God is by faith, through the righteousness of Christ, without regard to works of law. Of this Luther had so strong a perception, that he called it the article by holding or rejecting which, a church would stand or fall: and in this he judged rightly; for this doctrine is such a connecting link in the system, that he who has a firm hold of it, commands the whole chain of Christian principles; whereas, he who lets go this link, abandons the whole system of Christianity, and embraces a totally different and opposite religion. It was by the preaching of this doctrine that the apostles turned men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God; and they went on preaching with wonderful success; insomuch that the kingdom of Satan was like to have been overthrown in the world, and the kingdom of Christ established on its ruins; when, in order to prevent this catastrophe, the prince of darkness began to insinuate into the minds of the converts of Paul, that their own obedience to the law must have some share in the work of their salvation. This subtle poison of the serpent soon pervaded all the churches in Galatia; insomuch that the apostle, in a letter addressed to them, is constrained to say, that he stood in doubt of them; that is, he was led to doubt whether they were really Christians or not, Gal. iv. 20. He was afraid that he had bestowed on them all his labour in vain, iv. 11. because they sought justification as it were by the works of the law, especially by being circumcised and observing the law of Moses; he assured them, that seeking justification in this way, Christ would profit them nothing; and that if righteousness came by the law, that is, if men could obtain justification in this way, Christ had died in vain; there was no need of such a sacrifice, if men could obtain salvation by their own obedience.

This was the great antichrist that appeared in the world, while yet some of the apostles were alive. This formed the greatest obstruction to the progress of the gospel in the days of the apostles, and in those that followed; for the error was interwoven with the natural pride of the human heart, and found an advocate in the bosom of every unrenowned man. In process of time, the error was embodied into a system. It supplanted Christianity over a great part of the world; it took the name of that which it had supplanted; and thus was imposed upon the world a system of self-righteousness, superstition, and idolatry, having for its head a monster, who called himself the Vicar of



Christ, who professed to rule in the name of Christ ; but whose whole administration was directed to maintain the reign of darkness, and the influence of the prince of darkness over the souls of men.

Thus Popery had its origin in the self-righteous bias of the human heart, and a disposition to submit to any thing, rather than the humbling self-denying truth, that we must be justified before God, if justified at all, upon the footing of what Christ has done, not what we can do for ourselves ; and that for this we must be indebted to sovereign mercy. Disliking this method of salvation, the emissaries of the wicked one invented that system of rites and ceremonies which constitute what we call Popery. Their penances and pilgrimages, their masses and their merits of saints, their holy spittle and their holy water, their beads and their crucifixes, and the whole host of their superstitious observances, and idolatrous practices, were all invented for the very purpose of being put in the place of Christ's righteousness, and that by them a sinner might merit justification for himself, and appear before God in a righteousness of his own. Let the reader observe, this is not merely the Popery of the dark ages. It is publicly maintained at this very day by our Papists in Glasgow, and their organ in London, who scout at the idea of justification by faith in Christ, without regard to their own works and deservings ; though, alas ! if their works were tried by the righteous law of God, it would be found that their deservings are such as they could not think of without fearful apprehension : and I say this not of Papists only, but of every man who trusts in himself that he is righteous, and who does not, by a cordial reception of the gospel, submit to the righteousness of God.

Now, when the mind of Luther began to be opened to see the errors of Popery, he was directed, by a divine influence, I have no doubt, to fix his eye particularly upon this grand fundamental truth, which had long been denied by the Church of Rome, but which he found plainly taught in the New Testament, that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. He was not the first who discovered this truth, after it had been smothered for ages under the rubbish of Popery, for Wickliffe and Huss had taught it before him, and there were a few in the darkest ages who knew and lived by it ; but he was honoured by divine grace to apprehend it more distinctly, to teach it with more clearness, and enforce it with a more powerful eloquence, than had fallen to the lot of any man, for at least a thousand years. Of this his commentary on the epistle to the Galatians is a standing evidence : and well do I recollect the effect which some passages in this work had on my own mind, at a very early period of life. On the subject of justification, it contained, indeed, nothing more than I had learned to repeat from the shorter catechism, but it

was presented with a force of argument which I found altogether irresistible; and though it must have been thirty years ago, the impression remains to this day.

Luther having declared this to be a fundamental article in the Reformation of which he was honoured to be the instrument, he gave it a prominent place in the works which he published, and even in his private epistolary correspondence. The following is a specimen of the manner in which he handled this important subject. It is part of his comment on Gal. ii. 21. "For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." "These words of Paul ought diligently to be weighed and considered in this wise. Is it true that Christ suffered death or not? Again, did he suffer in vain or not? Here we are constrained to answer, unless we be stark mad, that he suffered in very deed, and that he suffered not in vain, nor for himself, but for us. If then he suffered not in vain, it followeth of necessity that righteousness cometh not by the law."

Then adverting to some of the evasions of Papists, by which they attempt to establish their own merits, he proceeds:—"Is this horrible blasphemy to be suffered or dissembled, that the divine Majesty, not sparing his own dear Son, but delivering him up to death for us all, should not do all these things seriously and in good earnest, but as it were in sport? Before I would admit this blasphemy, I would not only that the holiness of all the Papists and merit-mongers, but also of all the saints and holy angels should be thrown into the bottom of hell, and condemned with the devil. Mine eyes shall behold nothing else but this inestimable price, my Lord and Saviour Christ. He ought to be such a treasure to me, that all other things should be but dung in comparison of him. He ought to be such a light unto me, that when I have apprehended him by faith, I should not know whether there be any law, any sin, any righteousness, or any unrighteousness in the world. For what are all things which are in heaven and earth, in comparison of the Son of God, Christ Jesus, my Lord and Saviour, who loved me, and gave himself for me!

"This thundering and lightning from heaven against the righteousness of the law, and man's own righteousness, should make us to abhor it. And here with this thunder-clap fallett down all the orders of monks and friars, with all such superstitious religions. For who will not detest his vows, his cowl, his shaven crown, all men's traditions, yea the very law of Moses also, if he hear that for these things he rejected the grace of God, and maketh the death of Christ unprofitable. The world hearing this, doth not believe that it is true. It thinketh that such horrible wickedness cannot enter into any man's heart, that he should reject the grace of God, and esteem the death of Christ as a thing of nought. And yet this sin commonly reigneth. For

whosoever seeketh righteousness without Christ's, either by works, merits, satisfactions, afflictions, or by the law, rejecteth the grace of God, and despiseth the death of Christ, whatsoever he protesteth with his mouth to the contrary."

In his preface he thus writes:—"Do we then nothing? do we work nothing for the obtaining of this righteousness? I answer, Nothing at all. For this is perfect righteousness, to do nothing, to hear nothing, to know nothing of the law or of works; but to know and believe this only, that Christ is gone to the Father, and is not now seen; that he sitteth in heaven at the right hand of the Father, not as a judge, but made of God unto us, wisdom, righteousness, holiness, and redemption. Briefly, that he is our high priest, entreating for us, and reigning over us and in us by his grace.

"When I have this glorious righteousness dwelling in my heart, I descend from heaven as the rain, making fruitful the earth, that is to say, I come forth into another kingdom, and I do good works, how and whensoever occasion is offered. If I be a minister of the word, I preach, I comfort the broken-hearted, I administer the sacraments. If I be a householder, I govern my house and my family, I bring up my children in the knowledge and fear of God. If I be a magistrate, the charge that is given me from above, I diligently execute. If I be a servant, I do my master's business faithfully. To conclude, whosoever he be that is assuredly persuaded that Christ is his righteousness, doth not only cheerfully and gladly work well in his vocation, but also submitteth himself through love to the magistrates and to their laws, yea though they be severe, sharp, and cruel, and (if necessity so require) to all manner of burdens, and to all dangers of this present life, because he knoweth that this is the will of God, and that this obedience pleaseth him." In another place he writes:—"This I say to the end that no man should think we reject or forbid good works, as the Papists do most falsely slander us, neither understanding what they themselves say, or what we teach. They know nothing but the righteousness of the law, and yet they will judge of that doctrine which is far above the law, of which it is impossible that the carnal man should be able to judge. Therefore, they must needs be offended, for they can see no higher than the law."

These extracts afford a view of the doctrine of the Reformer, and of the manner in which he maintained it. There is a vehemence and boldness in his style, that show he was perfectly master of his subject, and fully assured of the ground on which he proceeded. I do not say that his mode of expression is in all instances the happiest that might be chosen. Some phrases are apt to startle a simple inquirer, and give occasion to misrepresent the doctrines of the gospel; such for instance as that in which



he includes the law of Moses among things to be *detested*. It is very evident that he means not the law considered in itself, which is holy, just, and good; but the law represented as a medium by which a sinner may obtain righteousness. In this view it must be rejected, otherwise we reject the righteousness of Christ; but in no sense whatever is the law of God an object of *detestation*. It is the error of misrepresenting the law, and putting it out of its proper place, that is to be detested.

Here it is proper to remark, that Luther's respect for the law of God, and his deep sense of the obligation of good works, were made manifest by his own personal character, which was such as to command the esteem and respect of those who most intimately knew him. Without this, indeed, he would have made a poor figure as a reformer of religion. Papists, aware of this, have spared no pains, by forgery and sheer lying, to deprive him of his fair character, that they might vilify the Reformation. He has indeed been represented as a monster of wickedness, who learned his religion from the devil, and had the devil for his familiar friend and companion; and the writer quoted in my last Number, by a sneer about his faithful Catherine, does more than insinuate that he taught and practised immorality; though the fact referred to, infers no more than that he lived happily with his lawful wife. Cotemporary enemies, however, knew better than to speak evil of his moral character. Nay, they are compelled to speak highly of it; and they even speak of this as one reason why so much respect was paid to him. "Luther," says the Popish historian Maimbourg, "in his sermons attacked the vices of men with great acrimony: he likewise published, in the German and in the Latin languages, a number of pious books." "Moreover, as *he lived a moral life, and was not given in the smallest degree to covetousness or any other vice*, he was universally held to be a good and great, and even a holy man; insomuch, that it was the custom to paint his portrait with rays of glory round his head, as if he had been a canonized saint." See *Milner's Church History*, vol. iv. p. 509.

Now we ought not to forget that it is of the nature of the doctrine which Luther taught, and made the basis of the Reformation, to produce such a character as he is here described to have been. The Popish doctrine of justification by works never produced a truly holy man; I mean a man devoted in heart and life to the service of God, and making his service and glory paramount to every selfish consideration. Such Luther seems to have been. Alexander, the Pope's agent employed to reclaim him, is said to have disliked him on account "of the soundness and purity of his morals. He is known to have said, 'it is impossible to soften Luther by money. He is a brute, who will not look either to bribes or honours; otherwise, he might long

ago have had many thousands paid to him at the banker's by the Pope's orders.' " *Milner*, vol. iv. p. 485, with the authorities in the margin.

It is not meant to assert that Luther was a perfect man, or that he had a perfect acquaintance with the whole of divine truth. He was miserably mistaken with regard to the presence of the real body of Christ in the sacrament; and he contended for his dogma with as much keenness, and with more asperity, than he did for the fundamental point of justification by faith. Indeed, his very asperity in the sacramental controversy should have led him, in his cooler moments, to suspect that he was wrong; for it is comparatively seldom that men lose temper, when they have truth on their side; whereas, it is scarcely possible to maintain and plead for error and nonsense, without getting into a passion.

Luther possessed many faults in point of temper, which no man knew better, and deplored more sincerely, than himself; but, in point of moral character, I do not only say that he will bear a comparison with the best of his adversaries, but that he stands in bright contrast with those who defamed and persecuted him. His associates, Melancthon, Ecolampadius, and others, were men of like character, and better temper. They were, in short, great lights in a dark age; and to them Europe, at this day, is under inexpressible obligations.

I know that my Popish neighbours will triumph greatly on account of my admission, that Luther erred, and that he had a violent temper; and what dependence, they will ask, can any man have on that religion, the founder of which was a fallible, and even an erring man? And I must tell them again, though they know it, that Protestants do not acknowledge Luther, or any mere man, as the founder of their religion; but that it has its foundation in the word of God, which Luther was an instrument of bringing to the view of the world at large, after the Church of Rome had done what she could to conceal it from public view; and it is one of the glories of that Reformation, that it has put it into the power of every man, and that it invites every man, to scrutinize the doctrines taught by him who was the chief instrument in that Reformation; and to reject such of them as we find not agreeable to the word of God; whereas, had we continued under the power of the Pope, we would not have been at liberty to scrutinize any doctrine, or believe or reject any thing, but as it might please the holy father. His children are slaves; those of the Reformation are free men.

The author on whom I am animadverting gravely tells us that Luther's disciples "have gradually learned to blush at the extravagance of their master: in the course of time they have silently abandoned his school, and have returned, on this point at least, nearer to the doctrine of scripture and common sense." I do not know that Luther has any disciples in this country; and as

for those who bear his name on the continent of Europe, if they have abandoned the doctrine of justification by faith, it is the worse for themselves. They are what Luther would have called in the state of a fallen church; and if they seek like the Papists, to be justified by their own works and deservings, it is of very little consequence what other tenets they may hold or reject. They are fallen from grace; Christ will profit them nothing. Gal. v. 2—4.

But though some churches have chosen to call themselves by the name of Luther, it is right the world should know, that the Reformer spurned with abhorrence the idea of having a sect named after him. In his warning against sedition and tumult, (says Milner, the historian, vol. v. p. 68.) he exhorts all men not so much as to mention his name in a sectarian view; not to call themselves Lutherans, but Christians. "The doctrine," says he, "is not mine, nor was I crucified for any one. Paul and Peter forbid the people to call themselves after their names: why should I, who am soon to be food for worms desire the children of Christ to be called by the name of so poor a creature? By no means! No! No! Let us have done with factious appellations; and be called Christians, because we possess the doctrine of Christianity. The Papists have very properly another name, because they are not content with Christ's name, and Christ's doctrine; they choose to be called Papists. Be it so, because they have a master. I desire to be no man's master. I hold with the Church the doctrine which belongs to us all in common, and of which Christ alone is the author."

The Churches of England and Scotland do not profess to be called after Luther, and it is unjust to call British Protestants his disciples; yet on the point of justification both Churches are entirely agreed with him. The former expresses herself as follows, in the eleventh article: "*Of the justification of man.* We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore that we be justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." And one would think, that to all who understand the terms, it must be comfortable to know, that our hope of salvation rests not upon the sand, but upon a foundation of divine righteousness that cannot be shaken. My opponents sneer at this, but it is the only sure anchor of hope to a perishing sinner. The doctrine of the Church of Scotland, and of almost all sects in this country, is precisely the same, with only a little difference in the mode of expression.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXII.

---

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 11th, 1820.

---

**MY** Popish opponent, **AMICUS VERITATIS**, in his affected zeal for good works, has done what he could to make them appear disagreeable, if not hateful in the esteem of his readers. In this respect, he has outheathened the very heathens; for they spoke of virtue as being its own reward; and though they understood not well what they meant, it is very clear that the doctrine which they intended to inculcate, was, that a good man was happier than a bad man, even in the present life, and whether the hope of a future state was taken into account or not. But **AMICUS VERITATIS**, and the author whom he takes for his guide, speak of virtue, or the way of holiness, as I choose rather to call it, as a rugged, uninviting, and thorny way. (See No. CXX. p. 125.) From this I infer, that they have no love to this way themselves, for no man would give an ill name to that which he loved, and in which he placed his delight.

“Our blessed Redeemer,” say my authors, “died for us, and still left the way to happiness strait and rugged.” This is the foundation of the Popish doctrine, that, notwithstanding what Christ has done, we must satisfy divine justice, and merit eternal life for ourselves. But where has Christ said that the way to happiness is strait and rugged? He has indeed said, “strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth to life, and few there be that find it;” but this straitness, or narrowness, arises not from the incapacity of the way, as if there were not room enough for all who should ever enter; but because, from the circumstance of few walking in it, the path is narrow. It is wide enough for all who shall ever go into it; and if the whole world were to enter, it would be wide enough for them all. “I am the door,” says Christ to all who hear his word, “by me if *any*

man enter in he shall be saved," which implies, that if *all men* would enter in they should be saved.

But Christ has not said a word about his way being *rugged*. On the contrary he describes it as smooth and pleasant. It is rest to the labouring and heavy laden. His yoke is easy, and his burden is light. Mat. xi. 28—30. Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace: Prov. iii. 17. According to the Popish doctrine, when sinners are turned from the evil of their ways, and begin to live a new life, that is, when they really begin to do good works, they enter upon a rugged path, so uninviting that few would choose to walk in it, and those who do enter upon it, may expect to be lacerated and torn by "the thorns of virtue." The plain English of this is, that the life of a real Christian must be a miserable one; and so it would, were it not for that doctrine which the Church of England declares to be wholesome and very full of comfort. (See No. CXX. p. 124.) Papists rejecting the righteousness of Christ, and trusting to their own doings, and their own penances, cannot possibly obtain comfort; for let them torment themselves ever so much, they can never be sure that they have done enough to satisfy divine justice. Nay, they may starve, or otherwise torture themselves to death, and yet not be sure that they may not be tormented in purgatory for a thousand years. Seeing AMICUS VERITATIS believes, and publicly maintains, that he must satisfy divine justice for himself, his language is perfectly natural. The way of good works must appear to him a rugged and a thorny path; and I appeal to every reader of common sense, whether good works are more likely to be promoted by such a representation of them, or by that which makes them appear amiable and profitable in the present life?

I maintain, that suppose there were no hereafter, a life of holiness, or, if you will, a life of good works, is infinitely more happy than a life of sin. AMICUS VERITATIS and his oracle assert, that Luther made the way to happiness spacious and commodious; and their meaning is, that he tolerated, and encouraged sinful practices, so that the way might be trodden with ease by thousands. Hence we derive this doctrine, that the way of sin is an *easy, spacious, and commodious* way. This is Popery, but like every other peculiarity of the system, it is directly opposed to the word of God. Here we are assured that the way of transgressors is hard. This is truly the rugged and the thorny way, which Papists falsely assert Christ to have left to his people, for his commandments are not grievous. If, therefore, Luther made the way to happiness easy and commodious, it was not by abolishing the obligation of good works, as my opponents falsely assert; but by showing how men became able to do good works, and to take pleasure in them, that is, by becoming interested in Christ by faith, and being renewed after the image of Christ unto

the love and practice of good works. This takes place in the experience of every man who truly believes the gospel. He enters upon the way of holiness; and he finds it inexpressibly a more pleasant way than the way of sin had been. Godliness hath the promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come. He is an enemy of true religion who represents it as a gloomy thing.

I shall be told perhaps that the scriptures give a different representation; that many are the afflictions of the righteous; that God's people are called an afflicted and poor people; and that, if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men the most miserable. I know that many are the afflictions of the righteous; but I know also that many are the horrors of the wicked; and that, while the afflictions of the former are counterbalanced by joy unspeakable, in possession and in prospect, the horrors of the latter are augmented by a certain fearful looking for of judgment: And that, if the former should be poor in this world, they are rich in faith and heirs of a kingdom, while the latter can derive no benefit from the wealth of this world, seeing they are poor towards God. As for Christians being of all men most miserable in this world, if it were not for the hope of another, I think any man who should assert this, must sadly mistake the meaning of the passage. The apostle is by no means asserting an axiom of general application; but merely a fact with regard to himself and other apostles, upon the supposition that they had been preaching a lie. If Christ were not risen from the dead, as some in the Corinthian church asserted, then were the apostles false witnesses for Christ,—all their preaching was vain,—those who had died in the faith had perished, after all that Christ had done and suffered, we can have no hope beyond this life; if these things were so, then we, the apostles, are the most miserable men in the world. That this is the meaning of the passage any one may see who reads the words in their connection. 1 Cor. xv. 12—19.

Christians do indeed suffer many things in common with the men of the world, and they have afflictions peculiarly their own, of which worldly men can form no conception. Some of these are described by the apostle Paul in his epistle to the Romans, seventh chapter. But these afflictions are not such as to justify the assertion, that the way of good works is a rugged and thorny way, as my opponents represent it. The righteous have more joy in their afflictions than the ungodly have even in their mirth; and then there is a remorse and horror which the ungodly suffer in their hours of sadness, from which the Christian is delivered by that gospel which brought peace to his conscience at first, and in the belief of which he continues to enjoy the peace of God which passeth all understanding. One thing is certain, that persons who had been in the most miserable state imaginable, when-



ever they believed the gospel preached by the apostles, were filled with joy and comfort. (See Acts ii. 42—47, and xvi. 34.) They never had done good works till then ; and they never knew till then what true happiness was. The same effects are produced at this day by the same gospel, wherever it is received, as those know best who are most engaged in the preaching of it, and in cultivating acquaintance with those who believe it.

But there is no gospel, that is, no good news for sinners in the Church of Rome. Popery is a system of bondage and terror. It affords no real peace to the conscience. It effects no change in the heart from sin to holiness. It furnishes neither means nor proper motives for the performance of good works ; and while it sets men to the work of satisfying divine justice for themselves, it makes them look upon God as unreconciled, and, therefore, as their enemy. In this state they must necessarily be alienated from God in their minds ; and such works as are pleasing to him, cannot be pleasing to them. This accounts for the language of *AMICUS VERITATIS*, and other papists, who represent the way of holiness as so rugged and thorny, that few would choose to walk in it. The language of Christ in his gospel is, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Mat. xi. 28. This is not the rest of idleness, but the far more comfortable rest of honourable and useful activity in the service of God, in doing those things which he has commanded, believing that our doing so is acceptable and pleasing to him, because our persons are accepted, and our sins pardoned, through the righteousness of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. This doctrine effectually teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in the present evil world. But the belief of the slave, who looks upon God as unreconciled, and as inflicting the punishment of his sins upon his own person, for the satisfaction of justice, possesses that alienation of mind from God, and that blindness of heart, which can produce nothing but wicked works.

The reader will be interested to know the feelings of Luther on this subject. While yet a monk, and living a blameless life, which could not have been said of all his brethren, he was actually a hater of God ; and if every one who thinks he must satisfy divine justice for himself, were to express the feelings of his mind with as much honesty, he would confess the same truth. "However blameless a life I might lead as a monk," says Luther, "I experienced a most unquiet conscience ; I perceived myself a sinner before God ; I saw that I could do nothing to appease him, and I hated the idea of a just God that punishes sinners. I was well versed in all St. Paul's writings ; and, in particular, I had a most wonderful desire to understand the epistle to the Romans. But I was puzzled with the expression, 'THEREIN is the righteousness of God revealed.' My heart rose almost against God

with a silent sort of blasphemy : At least in secret I said with great murmur and indignation, was it not enough that wretched man, already eternally ruined by the curse of original depravity, should be oppressed with every species of misery through the condemning power of the commandment, but that, even through the gospel, God should threaten us with his anger and justice, and thereby add affliction to affliction ? Thus I raged with a troubled conscience. Over and over I turned the above-mentioned passage to the Romans most importunately. My thirst to know the apostle's meaning was insatiable.

“ At length, while I was meditating day and night upon the words, and their connexion with that which immediately follows, namely, ‘the just shall live by faith,’ it pleased God to have pity upon me, to open mine eyes, and to show me that the righteousness of God, which is here said in the gospel to be revealed from faith to faith, relates to the method by which God, in his mercy, justifies a sinner through faith, agreeably to what is written, ‘the just shall live by faith.’ Hence I felt myself a new man, and all the scriptures appeared to have a new face. I ran quickly through them, as my memory enabled me ; I collected together the leading terms ; and I observed in their meaning a strict analogy according to my new views. Thus, in many instances, the work of God means that which he works in us ; and the power and wisdom of God, mean the power and wisdom which his Spirit operates in the minds of the faithful ; and in the same manner are to be understood the patience, the salvation, the glory of God.

“ The expression, *RIGHTEOUSNESS* of God, now became as sweet to my mind as it had been hateful before ; and this very passage of St. Paul proved to me the entrance into paradise.” *Luther's Works, Preface, Vol. I. quoted by Milner, Vol. IV. p. 419.*

It was a great mortification to the Papists, that they could find nothing against the moral character of Luther during his life ; but they thought it would equally serve the purpose of making odious the reformation of which he was the chief instrument, if they could make the world believe, that there was something mysterious and horrific in his death and burial. That he died in the faith and hope of the gospel, full of peace and comfort, has been certified by those who witnessed his last moments, for the truth of which I refer the reader to his *Life* by Melancthon, and others. But the Papists propagated the following ridiculous account of his death, and, for any thing I know, it is firmly believed by all good Papists to this day :—

“ That going to bed merry and drunk, he was found the next morning dead in his bed, his body being black, and his tongue hanging forth as if he had been strangled ; which some think was done by the devil, some by his wife. And that, as they bare

him to the church to bury him, his body so smelt, that they were fain to throw it into a ditch, and go their ways." This is the Popish fiction; but the recorded fact is, that Luther was buried with great pomp, in the Tower church in Wittemberg, by the appointment of the Prince Elector, "Bugenhagius making the funeral sermon, and Melancthon the oration."

Another Papist, a Jesuit, wrote as follows: "The same day that Luther died, many that were possessed of devils, in a town of Brabant, were on a sudden delivered, and not long after possessed again. And when it was demanded of the devils, where they had been? they answered, that by the appointment of their prince, they were called forth to the funeral of Luther. And this was proved to be true, because a servant of Luther's, who was in the chamber when he died, opening a casement to take in air, saw near unto him a great number of black spirits hopping and dancing." *See the Works of John White, folio, London, 1624, § 57.* It is pleasant to see how these stories neutralize one another. If Luther had a servant in his chamber when he died, it would not have been left as a matter of uncertainty, whether it was the devil or his wife that was the immediate cause of his death; and if a legion of devils had been called from Brabant to attend his funeral, it is not probable that they would have left his body in a ditch unburied. Such are some of the reflections of the author from whom my account is taken.

But the following is worthy of the most particular attention, being more than doubly miraculous, seeing it contains an account of the death and burial of a man who was alive and in perfect health. I quote from the same section of the same author, who gives his authority in the margin,—

"A horrible miracle, and such as was never heard of before; that God, who ever is to be praised, in the foul death of Martin Luther, damned in body and soul, showed for the glory of Christ, and the amendment and comfort of the godly. When Martin Luther fell into his disease, he desired the body of our Lord Jesus to be communicated to him; which having received, he died soon after. And when he saw his end approach, he desired that his body might be laid upon the altar, and worshipped with divine honours. But God, willing at the length to make an end of horrible errors, by a huge miracle warned the people to desist from the impiety that Luther had brought in. For his body being laid in the grave, on the sudden such a tumult and terror arose, as if the foundation of the earth had been shaken. Whereupon, they that were present at the funeral, grew amazed with fear, and lifting up their eyes, saw the holy host hanging in the air. Wherefore, with great devotion they took it, and laid it in a holy place; which being done, this hellish noise was heard no more. The next night after, was heard a noise and cracking about Luther's tomb, much louder than before, which waked all that were



in the city out of their sleep, trembling, and almost dead for fear. Wherefore, in the morning, opening the sepulchre where Luther's detestable body was laid, they found neither body nor bones, nor clothes, but a stink of brimstone coming out of the grave, and well nigh killed all the standers by. By the which miracle, many being terrified, reformed their lives to the honour of the Christian faith, and the glory of Jesus Christ." The above having spread over all Italy, and perhaps the greater part of Europe, fell at last into the hands of Luther himself, who, in perfect good humour, and not the least dismayed by the "horrible miracle" relating to his own funeral, wrote under the narrative as follows:—"I, Martin Luther, by this my hand-writing, confess and testify, that, upon the twenty-first of March, I received this fiction concerning my death, as it was full of malice and madness; and I read it with a glad mind, and a cheerful countenance, but yet detested this blasphemy, whereby a stinking lie is fathered upon the divine majesty of God. As concerning the rest, I cannot but rejoice and laugh at the devil's malice, wherewith he and his rout, the Pope and his complices, pursue me. And God convert them from this devilish malice. But if this my prayer be for the sin that is unto death, that it cannot be heard, then God grant that they may fill up the measure of their sin, and with such lying libels as this, let them delight themselves one with another, to the full."

Luther was accustomed in his writings to ascribe evil thoughts, and suggestions of error, to the immediate agency of the devil. Thus, when he was suffering any temptation of this kind, he would say, "the devil told me so and so." In some of his works, he speaks of his temptations, and the opposition which he was enabled to make from the word of God, as if it had been a dialogue between the devil and himself. He had many anxious cogitations with regard to the great work in which he was engaged. These sometimes kept him awake in his bed; and when some discouraging suggestion occurred to his mind, and his courage was in danger of being shaken, he would say, in recording the fact, that the devil came to him at such an hour of the night, and pressed him with many weighty arguments; and then he would narrate how he answered the devil by such and such passages of scripture. In this there was nothing more than the occasional misgivings of a great mind, appalled by the magnitude of the work which he had undertaken, and an acknowledgment of the support which he derived from the word of God. But certain Popish writers, affecting to understand Luther's words in their literal sense, have stoutly maintained, and it is asserted to this day, that he held real and personal conferences with the devil, received his instructions from him, and was taught by him to argue so stoutly against the Church of Rome. "About Luther's conferences with the Devil," is the title of a chapter of a quarto

volume which I have before me. The writer professes to have been brought up a Protestant, but falling into great doubts, he was led to examine the foundation of religion, and he became in due time a confirmed Papist. The circumstance of Luther's having been a disciple of the devil, had, it seems, great weight on his mind, in making him suspect the truth of Protestantism : but let us hear his own account of the matter :—

“And as for the matter of the devil's suggestion, both to M. Luther for rejecting the mass, and other articles of the Roman religion, and to Zuinglius for rejecting the real presence, did most stick in my mind, and caused some horror to think, that we in England should follow a doctrine revealed by the devil himself, I was very desirous to read the story at large in Luther himself: wherefore, I sought out Luther's works, and in the book *de Missa angulari, et de consecratione sacerdotum*, or, as others entitle it, *de Missa privata, et unctione sacerdotum* ; and, for more certainty, I sought two editions of his works, the one of Wittemberg, Tome vii. the other of Jena, Tome vi. in which book is recounted at large the conference, or rather, large dispute which Luther saith he had with the devil, or the devil rather with him, about the mass.”—*A Search, &c. by Francis Walsingham*, p. 130.

The writer goes on to quote certain scraps of sentences from Luther's works ; and, with great seriousness and apparent candour, he finds it his duty to renounce the doctrines taught by one who was so familiar with the devil. “Moreover,” says he, “whereas before, I had a great aversion to believe that such a man of God as Luther, chosen to so great a work, (as I persuaded myself he was) should have any familiarity or conversation at all with the devil, and therefore could hardly believe that he should write of himself, that he knew him well, and *that he had eaten more than a bushel of salt with him*, and other such speeches recounted in the Defence of the censure ; now reading over sundry parts of his works extant in print, I found many speeches of his not much differing from the other.” Thus it appears the story about the bushel of salt is taken from another book, not from Luther himself. It is only a proverbial expression to intimate great familiarity ; and the author is satisfied that it is Luther's, because in his own works he reads expressions “not much differing from the other,” though Papists know well how to make a great difference in the meaning of a sentence, by a small omission or a small addition.

I have quoted these ridiculous conceits, to let the reader see to what contemptible arts Popish writers have had recourse, to pervert the writings, and calumniate the memory of the great Reformer. I have great abundance of such matter, relating to Calvin and other reformers, but I think the foregoing will be considered enough as a sample.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXIII.

~~~~~  
*SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18th, 1820.*  
~~~~~

FEW objects, of late, have received more of the public attention than the state of Ireland, and the improvement of our fellow-subjects in that kingdom. By the well directed efforts of several societies, founded upon the most benevolent and liberal principles, many thousands of the poor peasantry are receiving an education that enables them to read the Word of God, and from the same, or similar benevolent sources, they are receiving Bibles to read. The Pope and his clergy have taken the alarm, knowing that their craft is at stake, and that the great goddess of Rome, whom the world has so long worshipped, is in danger of being set at nought. His holiness has issued another bull, of date the 20th of August last, against the wolves in sheep's clothing, namely, the benevolent men who are giving the people the Word of God, and teaching them to read it. This new bull is little more than a second edition of the one which I reviewed in my eighty-first, and some succeeding Numbers; so that I need not waste my time in exposing the falsehoods and absurdities which it contains.

For the farther information of my readers, I shall proceed to lay before them an interesting extract of a letter from a Gentleman in Ireland, with whom I am personally acquainted, and on whose veracity I have the most complete reliance. The letter is addressed to a clergyman of the church of Scotland, who has kindly favoured me with this extract: I forbear giving the writer's name lest it should expose him to inconvenience among his Popish neighbours:—

“ I shall now direct your attention to a few remarks on the state of Ireland in general, collected since I came to the country by personal observation. Much has been said on the demoralization of Ireland, and many causes have been assigned in order to account for them; but, as I could not see the operation of the causes which I had so often heard of, I resolved to satisfy myself



on the subject by personal enquiry ; and, accordingly, in going out to itinerate, having a horse belonging to ———, I rode through the country in different directions, going into the houses, and conversing with the people in every mode I could think of, in order to elicit the information I wished to acquire. After a considerable time spent in this way, I called upon the priests, and, in conversing with them, made the best use that I could of the hints of information which I had received from the people. The priests are very cautious in speaking with Protestants ; and, therefore, from many of them I could ascertain very little. But the aggregate of their respective information perfectly corroborated the information which I had previously received from the people, and I think put me in possession of the real cause of the degradation of Ireland.

“ The mass of the Irish population is entirely in the hands of the priests, and governed by a system of policy, consolidated by a union of design and operation, which extends to every spot within the precincts of the kingdom of Ireland. To make this plain I shall be more particular.—The parish priests are the sole judges in their respective parishes, not only in an ecclesiastical, but also in a civil capacity. The people resort to them for information on every point of law that may affect either their conduct or their property ; and, whether the information obtained in this way is correct or not, few will think of going further to inquire. All differences among the people are also referred to the decision of the priest ; and from his judgment there is seldom an appeal. Should it be necessary to make oath in any disputed case, this also is done before the priest ; and, to avoid the law, which restricts the administration of oaths to magistrates, the person deposing before the priest must declare that he does so by voluntary oath ; and should the affidavit thus made be committed to writing, which it often is, it is signed by the priest as voluntarily made before him, he considering himself as only a witness, while he is in fact the real administrator of the oath, and regarded as such by the party who makes it, as well as by the party for whose satisfaction it is made. Written affidavits obtained in this way are frequently to be met with ; and more importance is attached to them, even by Protestants, than to affidavits made before magistrates. Many of the priests go so far as to inflict punishment, by penance, in cases tried before them ; and I have not been able to discover an instance where the penance has not been performed. Thus their authority over their flocks is both legislative and executive ; and I am sure that the greatest despot could not meet a readier compliance with his mandates, than is given to the “ *ipse dixit* ” of these ecclesiastical tyrants. Another source of the influence of the priests, is their interference with the commercial concerns of their parishes. When any thing is to be sold in a parish, it must be advertised by the priest from the altar, after the celebration of mass ; for if it is not, the people are taught to infer, that the proprietor of the article to be sold, is not in favour with

the priest ; and in that case he will find no purchasers. This is so notoriously the case, that when gentlemen in the country have any thing for sale, the result of the sale will be in exact proportion to the degree of good understanding that may exist between them and the priest. In public establishments, such as breweries, the case is the same. I have known the proprietors of such establishments give, in some instances, regular salaries to some of the most active of the priests, in order to have the sale of their commodities promoted by them, through their influence over the people. Some gentlemen among the Protestant landed interest of the country, do the same for the protection of their property.

“The priests have another mode of exerting their influence in the country, which checks most effectually the efforts of the clergy of the establishment, without appearing openly against them. Whenever any of the clergy begin to be active in the discharge of their parochial duties, the priests throw out their innuendoes, and the people soon take them up. When the collectors of the tithes go round for the tithes, they are shot at, and in many cases killed, and the clergyman is necessitated to relax his diligence, or lose his income, and perhaps his life. But if the minister be in good terms with the priest, (which he never can be unless he is inactive) the tithes may be collected with ease, and his life is perfectly secure.

“In addition to this, the priests are further supported in maintaining their system, by the constant intercourse which they keep up with their parishioners. Every individual in the parish, professing Popery, must confess to the priest, at least twice a year, at Easter and Christmas, when every thing must be told without reserve, even to the trifles of domestic life. The priests are thus in possession of every thing that can occur within their respective parishes ; and, from the particularity of their enquiries, when they receive confessions, they can ascertain with the greatest precision, the bent and disposition of the people’s minds, as well as the different objects to which they may be directed, and the different points of view in which these objects may be considered. Add to this, that when the priests hear confessions, they always direct the party, as to future conduct, according to the confession made ; and, in this particular, they are sure to keep the interests of their system in view. The priests send a regular detail of the information thus acquired, to their respective bishops ; who, in their turn, transmit it to the primate, and when the primate issues his annual address to the bishops, founded on the information thus received, they echo back his instructions in their diocesan charges to their priests, with such alterations as localities may require.

“With regard to the catholic question, the people are entirely in the dark. The priests never present it to them in a distinct point of view. They know, that if they were to enter into details, it would be impossible to convince the lower orders that they

could be benefited by the much talked of emancipation ; and therefore, to keep their minds in a constant agitation on the subject, they state the case generally, and in doing so, ascribe all the misery which exists in the country, to the refusal of government to grant their request. This puts both the government and the question, in a false point of view before the people ; but the priests gain their end by it, and the minds of the Catholics become more and more embittered against the Protestants, every time that the subject is discussed. Thus you may perceive that every subject is made a handle of by the priests, to secure the attachment of the people ; and in proportion as they succeed in securing their attachment, they will succeed in blinding their minds ; for as ignorance is the mother of their devotion, so is she also the foundation on which their system stands. And every thing that can contribute to make this foundation more secure, is seized with an alacrity, and managed with an energy and address, which would astonish you. Popery, in short, is more than a religious system in this country ; it is a political constitution perfectly distinct from the constitution of the empire, and conducted with such consummate dexterity, that many, who are under its influence, have no idea of its existence. It presents only one of its wheels at a time, while it conceals the grand engine by which that wheel is kept in motion ; and, unless it be inspected with a watchfulness, equal to that which its conductors exercise for its concealment, the construction and operations of the machine can never be known.

“ I respect the I. E. S. much, because I am convinced that as it has been the means of good to many, so it will be the means of good to many more : but I am certain, that if it were to identify with the objects which it has already taken up, that species of investigation to which I have alluded, it would be more generally useful, and its other plans would be more successfully executed. By the society’s plan of preaching, its ministers have access only to some of the less bigoted Protestants, but by enquiring into the state of things among the Catholics, and acting on the information obtained, we open a door of general usefulness, and strike at the root of all the evils which exist in the country. I am so convinced of the necessity of this, that I am almost certain that no radical change in the moral or religious system of Ireland will be effected until it is done. The priests and their priest-craft must be dragged from their unhallowed concealment, and exposed to the just indignation of their deluded people, before the enthralling system, by which Ireland has so long been held in chains, can be overthrown.

“ My attention has been long directed to this important work ; but the host of the enemy is so numerous, that unless I could devote my whole time to it, I could not enter the field against them formally, although I do what I can when they come in my way. Could men be found who would unite their exertions to discover the nature and extent of the evils connected with the Po-



lish system, as it now exists in Ireland, and to apply an efficient remedy, generations yet unborn would bless their memory, while they would enjoy, in the success of their labours, a present reward. I would not have dwelt so long on this subject, were I not convinced that there are many in Scotland who might be usefully employed in the cause I am pleading, and who perhaps may be influenced by the statement I have made, at least to give the subject their serious consideration. It involves the cause of souls, and the cause of souls is the cause of God and of his Christ: I have much more to say to you, but I am afraid I have already been too prolix."

It is difficult to imagine a state of more grievous bondage than that of the Irish people, under the domination of these ghostly tyrants. Every lover of his country is interested, therefore, in promoting the education of the youth among them, in order that by the slow, but sure operation of truth, the reign of error may be subverted, and Popery utterly extirpated. This is a consummation most devoutly to be wished for; and I think a train is laid by which it will be brought about, before the present generation pass away. The Pope himself seems to be aware of this, and to have a dread of it upon his mind. His weeping and wailing on occasion of the Bible schools, is like the screeching of the owl when the dawn threatens the approach of the sun, whose rising he cannot prevent. An old priest is said to have remarked lately to his younger brethren, "I shall have my time of it; but you, young men, look to yourselves."

From the above statement it is easy to see, that the condition of the established clergy, in the more Popish parts of the country, must be extremely uncomfortable and insecure. If they are conscientious in the discharge of their duty, and if they presume to collect the provision which the law has made for them, it is at the hazard of their lives. Popery is therefore, in Ireland at this day, as hostile to the propagation of the gospel, as Mahomedanism is in Turkey, or heathenism in China. Let it be observed, it is not the mere collection of tythes that provokes the hostility of the Popish priests, it is also official diligence in the discharge of pastoral duties. If a parish minister shall preach the gospel to the poor, if he visit the sick, if he instruct the ignorant, if he warn his flock against false doctrine and the intrusion of false teachers, all which he is bound in duty to do, he is in danger of being shot at, and of losing his life. Now, as it is to be feared, there are many of the clergy of the established church in that kingdom, as well as elsewhere, who have not the courage and zeal of apostles, and who have no ambition for the crown of martyrdom, it is not surprising that non-residence and neglect of duty should prevail to a great extent. While this in some measure accounts for the fact, it is by no means a justification of it. Error will never be effectually put down, nor will the kingdom of

Christ be universally established until more of the apostolic spirit, that is, more of the spirit of Christ himself, appear among those who are called his ministers. I know that Ireland is not altogether destitute of men endowed by the Holy Spirit,—full of zeal in the cause of the gospel both in the established church and out of it; but how few are they in proportion to the millions who are sitting in gross darkness!

If the churches in general were filled by such persons as I have here referred to, the cause between truth and error would soon be brought to an issue. If the instructions communicated by the Bible read in the schools, were followed up by preaching the gospel publicly, and from house to house, there can be no doubt the blessing of God would accompany the means of his own appointment, for turning many from their vain idols to the service of the living God. Popery could not long maintain its ground before the influence of truth, brought home to the heart and conscience, by the kind and affectionate ministrations of men whose own lives were cast in the mould of the gospel, and who were enabled to exhibit its kindly and sanctifying influence in their whole conversation and conduct. Some of them would no doubt lose their lives in the service; but this would be unspeakable gain to themselves, and it would hasten the overthrow of antichrist. We shall hear no more of farther concessions to the Papists, or of investing them with political power, when they shall appear among ourselves in their true character of bloody persecutors, as they always have been when they had power in their hands, and as I venture to predict they will be again, even without political power, or any other power than that which they usurp over their blinded adherents, whenever faithful ministers shall begin to labour in the manner which I have described, in those districts over which they claim spiritual oversight and authority. Popery, at this day, has not a firmer hold of Ireland than it had of Scotland, at the period of the reformation; yet we know how it was subverted, and almost extirpated, by means of preaching and suffering. The eloquence of a Knox was not more instrumental in effecting the happy change, than the blood of a Hamilton, a Mill, and a Wishart. Christ will be served by men who count not their lives dear to themselves, but who are willing to lay them down for his sake, and if all the clergy of Ireland were but half as much devoted to the service of Christ, as the soldiers of King George are to his service, we should soon hear of victories more glorious than ever were achieved upon the mountains of Spain, or the plain of Waterloo. It would be the victory of truth over error, of the kingdom of light over the prince of darkness.

It is one of the pleasing effects which result from the circulation of my Numbers in Ireland, that certain facts are corroborated and illustrated by persons who are acquainted with them, of which

I shall here give a curious instance. In my seventy-eighth Number, page 224, of vol. second, I gave an account of a priest having bequeathed money to procure masses for his soul, at the rate of 1s. 7d. each, which it seems should have been only 1s. 6d. ;\* but all the rest is confirmed, with the following curious illustration for which I am indebted to a correspondent of undoubted credit. "I was well acquainted with father Lonergan of ——— who left the three legacies, and a more rational man by a fire-side, in general matters, I never knew ; but to such a delusion are the wisest of them given up to believe a lie, that this man in his will gave a rare instance of spiritual foolishness and carnal wisdom, that makes one smile. The reason assigned in his will for ordering 1s. 6d. masses, was, 'and whereas the only difference between a guinea mass and a shilling mass consisting in the *intention* of the priest ; and knowing by experience that whatever priests may say or intend, there is very little difference between the intention given in the one and in the other, I do will and direct, that the money be applied in masses of one and sixpence each, being persuaded that there is more intention in a hundred masses at one and sixpence each, than in twenty or more at a guinea each, and therefore more benefit to my soul !!!' I did not conceive what was the blindness of the human mind till I heard this part of the will. I got a new insight into the human mind, and the character of Popery."

There can be no doubt, I think, that this poor man really believed that his soul would derive some benefit from these masses ; and yet he knew that all the benefit would depend upon the intention of the priests that should say them. Mr. Fletcher says somewhere in his Lectures, upon authority which he adduces, that many of the priests in Ireland do not really believe in transubstantiation, and that their scepticism on this point is a leading article in their confessions to one another ; and a learned divine of the Church of England, who honours me with his correspondence, in a letter received a few days ago, assures me that Papists in England are allowed to disbelieve the same dogma in their hearts, provided they do not deny it with their lips : But here is a priest, and a polite gentleman too, upon the point of death, and making his last will, who seemed to believe most sincerely, that the money which he left behind him, would procure benefit to his soul after death. This can be accounted for only upon the ground of the divinely attested fact, that when men receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved, they are given up to strong delusions, that they may believe a lie.

This holy father, without intending it, has left in his last will and testament, a strong testimony against his religion. The virtue of the sacraments, and of the mass in particular, depends in a great measure, if not entirely, upon the intention of the officiating

\* The difference may be reconciled by supposing the one to be Irish, the other sterling money.



priest. He could not be sure that the masses said for his soul after death should be accompanied by the necessary intention ; nay, there is reason to think the priests would owe him a grudge, seeing he imposed upon them the drudgery of doing a job for eighteen pence, for which they might as well have had a guinea ; and, therefore, it is probable that they would take their revenge by saying his masses without any intention at all. At least he could not know but this might be the case ; and, therefore, he could have no real hope in his death. The gospel believed gives a sure and certain hope of rest beyond the grave ; and he that continues to the end shall be saved, without a peradventure. The righteous, therefore, hath hope in his death ; but the Papist can have no such hope. It is at best mere peradventure with him. He is not only all his lifetime subject to bondage ; but he dies in a state of bondage. It must be a miserable thing to trust in the doings of a fellow-creature ; and yet Papists have not so much as even this to depend upon. Their whole dependence is upon the intention, that is, the secret thought of him who performs a certain ceremony. This melancholy view of Popery, which shows it to be truly ruinous to the souls of men, is confirmed by the dying words of one of its own priests, and he one of the best of his order. Surely every man who has a feeling of compassion for the souls of poor sinners, held thus in bondage by the devil, ought to lend his aid that such a delusion may be banished from the earth.

From the same correspondent, and in the same letter, I am furnished with the following curious particulars:—" Carrick is in the county of Tipperary ; the county of Kilkenny commences about a mile from it, divided by a stream,—one in Ossory, the other in Cashell diocese. For many years the lents in Cashell diocese were black lents, and no meat allowed. In Ossory they were generally white lents, Kilkenny being more refined, and they had power to eat meat twice a week or more. The priests of Carrick not being able to eat meat in Tipperary county, always took advantage of the white lent in Ossory. Accordingly there was a public-house kept at the other side of the bridge that divides the county of Tipperary. It was kept by so notorious a woman that she was called Kate Heart ; that is, she had too tender a heart to deny any man. At this woman's house the Carrick priests used to bespeak a meat dinner, on the Ossory meat-days, and from fifteen to twenty of them dined there during lent. They crossed the stream which was the line of demarkation between a curse and a blessing ; and with all manner of jolification they feasted and drunk till they were right full of what, had they eaten it at the other side of the bridge five yards wide, would have been an abomination fraught with mortal sin. There were cars to bring home those who were too wise to walk. This is keeping lent. Oh, Popery, what art thou !"

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXIV.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25th, 1820.  
~~~~~

THE *holy* Inquisition is the next subject that comes in my way according to the plan which I have prescribed to myself. As this is a tribunal established for the very purpose of taking cognizance of heresy, that is, any departure from the standard of faith which the Church of Rome has established, and of punishing to the uttermost all who shall be found guilty, or even suspected, of such deviation, it will not be considered impertinent to introduce the subject with a few remarks on persecution for conscience' sake.

There can be nothing more certain, than that the genius of Christianity is hostile to persecution in every form. The Gospel is addressed to the understanding, and to the heart of man, with this very solemn intimation, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned." The condemnation of unbelief, which is the only deadly heresy, is not committed to fellow-creatures for the purpose of being executed upon the persons of unbelievers in the present life. Unbelief is not a sin against men, but against God, whose testimony it rejects, and whose veracity therefore it impeaches. He reserves the judgment in this case to himself. He has commanded no man to interfere in the matter; and no man, and no church, has a right to interfere in it, farther than to declare, that he who rejects the divine testimony, can have no part in any divine ordinance. He is, therefore, with propriety, excluded from the fellowship of the visible church, but he ought not to suffer damage either in his person or property.

But there are persons who do not reject the divine testimony, but who really receive it, and who ought to be acknowledged as belonging to the household of faith, whose minds are but partially enlightened, with regard to many things connected with the faith and obedience of the Gospel. Now it was never meant by Christ, or taught by his apostles, that such persons should be compelled, by force, to think rightly upon every religious subject. The thing is

absurd and impossible, for mind will not yield to any external pressure ; and the Word of God authorizes no means for removing mistakes from the human mind, but instruction and persuasion ; and these have often been found successful, while the world may be challenged to produce an instance of conviction of truth, having been effected by brute force.

The use of compulsion, in relation to religious opinion, originated with the enemies of the truth, who, conscious that they could not maintain their ground by fair argument, had recourse to the power which they possessed in the strength of their arm, or the number of their adherents. Cain stands at the head of the black catalogue of persecutors. He was sadly mistaken with regard to the character of God, and the way of approaching to him with acceptance. Abel thought rightly on this most important subject ; but it does not appear that he ever thought of compelling his elder brother to adopt more just ideas, or of murdering him if he did not. It was then, as in all subsequent ages : He that was after the flesh persecuted him that was after the Spirit. Every false religion excites its adherents to persecute the true religion, or to oppose it by force ; but the spirit of Christianity is most remote from this ; and, if any real Christian ever thought of promoting truth, or opposing error by other means than instruction and persuasion, he had learned his lesson, and taken his example from antichrist.

The primitive Christians suffered much from the Jews and the Heathens, especially the former, who, as they were the murderers of the Lord of glory, were also the most furious persecutors of his disciples. After the subversion of their nation, and their being deprived of the power of persecuting to any great extent, the work of wholesale murder was taken up by the Roman emperors, by whom many thousand Christians were destroyed for no crime but that of being Christians, which in Roman reckoning was enough to incur the sentence of being thrown to be devoured by wild beasts. It was not long after Constantine had taken Christianity under his protection, that persons, called Christians, began to persecute one another ; but by this time the glory was departed. The word Christian, had acquired a different meaning from that which it bore when first applied to the disciples at Antioch. Augustine and other early fathers strongly condemned violence on account of religion ; but their voice was not heard. Heresy was considered a crime of the first magnitude ; this was often a mere nickname of the truth, and the abettors of it were devoted to destruction. But persecution in every hideous form was never so completely reduced to a system, as after the Pope was seated upon his throne, showing himself as a god, having all power in heaven and in earth.

“In the following ages,” says Limborch, speaking of a period subsequent to the age of Augustine, “the affairs of the church were so managed under the government of the Popes, and all per-



sons so strictly curbed by the severity of the laws, that they durst not even so much as whisper against the received opinions of the church. Besides this, so deep was the ignorance that had spread itself over the world, that men, without the least regard to knowledge and learning, received, with a blind obedience, every thing that the ecclesiastics ordered them, however stupid and superstitious, without any examination; and if any one dared in the least to contradict them, he was sure immediately to be punished; whereby the most absurd opinions came to be established by the violence of the Popes." *Hist. Inq. chap. vii.*

In the twelfth century it was found, that a numerous people inhabiting the valleys of Piedmont, held certain doctrines different from those which the Pope commanded all men to receive, on pain of death. The people have been called Albigenses and Waldenses. The principal articles of their faith were substantially the same with those of the Reformation. It is not certain when or by whom such doctrines were first promulgated among them; but I think it is probable, that the truth of the Gospel found an asylum among these mountains and valleys, after it had been banished from Rome, and from every other part of the world to which the Pope could extend his influence. It is probable that the number of professors was very few for many ages; and, therefore, they escaped the notice of the holy see; but by the time mentioned they had become numerous; and they excited the utmost hatred of the Pope and his adherents. It was with a view to extirpate them that the Inquisition was established, and that *Saints* Dominic and Francis, the first inquisitors, were set a-hunting after the precious lives of a simple and virtuous people, a thousand times more worthy than themselves.

It was the fashion, however, of the Church of Rome then, as it has always been since, to represent those who dissented from her errors as monsters of one kind or another. They could not persuade the world that the Waldenses were monsters of wickedness; for all who knew them, bare witness that they were a peaceable and harmless people; but they did succeed in their misrepresentations so far as to make the Duke of Savoy, and perhaps many others believe, that they, or at least their children, were not formed like other human creatures. At the instigation of the Pope, a cruel and murderous war had been carried on against the Waldenses, many of whom were subjects of the Duke of Savoy. He seeing his country in danger of being ruined by such violent measures, found means to put an end to the war: "Nay," says the historian from whom I quote, "it pleased God so to touch his heart with compassion for that poor people, that he spoke it openly, that for as much as he had always found them to be most faithful and obedient subjects, he would not suffer them to be so dealt with, by force of arms in future: only for what was past, he ordered for formality's sake, that twelve of them should come to Pignerol where he then was, there to beg his pardon,

for taking up arms in their own defence ; the which they accordingly did, and his highness receiving them courteously, forgave them freely all that had passed during the time of the war, giving them to understand, that he had been misinformed, both as to their persons and their principles ; and withal he desired to see some of their little ones, because there were some who had made him believe, that they were strange and monstrous creatures, having but one eye in their forehead, with four sets of black teeth, with many other such like fictions ; whereupon some were brought before him, and he finding them, on the contrary, handsome shapen and well favoured, did openly profess, how ill satisfied he was with the calumnies and slanders of their malicious adversaries, and thereupon did not only confirm their privileges and liberties, but withal made them a gracious promise to settle and establish the same for the time to come. And this was undoubtedly the real intention and resolution of that prince at that time, however afterwards wrought upon (or at least deluded) by the subtle devices of the Inquisitors, who took the boldness, notwithstanding all the gracious promises of their prince, to continue to persecute those poor Waldenses, laying violent hands on them, and delivering them up to the secular powers, who also, in most places, were not at all backward to lend them their helping hand." *Moreland's History of the Evangelical Churches in Piedmont, folio, page 223.*

Thus we see, that Popish malice against the professors of true Christianity, showed itself not only in speaking evil of their character and principles, but also in misrepresenting their personal form, so as to make princes believe that they were not human creatures, but something worse than wild beasts, that ought to be run down and destroyed ; and, indeed, they were run down, and murdered with a ferocity such as has never been equalled by any attempt to extirpate the most savage beasts of the forest. For which see Moreland's History above quoted, and Jones' History of the Waldenses.

"It was the entire study and endeavour of the Popes, to crush in its infancy, every doctrine that any way opposed their exorbitant power. In the year 1163, at the synod of Tours, all the bishops and priests in the country of Tholouse, were commanded to take care, and to forbid, under the pain of excommunication, every person from presuming to give reception, or the least assistance to the followers of this heresy, which first began in the country of Tholouse, whenever they should be discovered. Neither were they to have any dealings with them in buying or selling ; that by being thus deprived of the common assistances of life, they might be compelled to repent of the evil of their way. Whosoever shall dare to contravene this order, let him be excommunicated as a partner with them in guilt. As many of them as can be found, let them be imprisoned by the Catholic princes, and punished with

the forfeiture of all their substance." *Limb. Hist. Inq. chap. ix.* This edict is expressed in pretty intelligible language. The heretics themselves were not only to be extirpated with fire, and sword, and famine; but every man who should show them the smallest favour, were it only selling a loaf to one of them, or giving him a drink of cold water, was to be excommunicated as a partner in the guilt of heresy; and this implied imprisonment, the forfeiture of goods, and of life itself. Such are the tender mercies of the wicked; such was Popery in the days of its glory; and such it is, and must be still, where it has space and opportunity to show its true character, for it is an infallible system, and, therefore, incapable of change to the better. I call upon the Papists in Ireland to answer this. They are living in peace, so far as they are able to live peaceably; they have the utmost freedom even in observing their idolatrous rites; they suffer no sort of molestation whatever on account of their religion; and yet they lately complained in a letter to the Pope, that they were the victims of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrrieved a Christian people. I have no desire to see the experiment tried upon them; but I think it would teach them a useful lesson, if they were placed but for one day, in the situation in which the holy father, their lord the Pope, placed the Waldenses, and all who should presume, for mere humanity's sake, to give any of them a cup of cold water. They and their oratorical demagogues would then learn what the word, persecution, means; for at present, they do not understand what they have never felt or seen.

The holy church instigated several sovereign princes to commence a crusade against the poor people who were desirous of living at peace with all men; and who asked nothing of any man, but to be allowed to possess and read the Word of God, and to worship him as that word dictated. This crusade was more murderous and cruel than that against the Turks for the recovery of the holy land, and similar or greater indulgences were granted to all who should take up the cross in the Popish sense of the expression. Those who went against the Turks, wore the sign of the cross on their backs; but those who went against the Waldenses wore it on their breasts. No historian that I have read, has attempted to account for this difference in the position of the Popish idol. I give it, therefore, as a conjecture of my own, that when these heroic children of the Pope contemplated an encounter with so fierce a people as the Turks, they had an idea, that their backs would have more need of protection than their fronts; and, therefore, they placed the idol behind, expecting, no doubt, that it would protect both itself and them, from enemies whom they could not see after they had turned about. But they knew that the Waldenses were far from being formidable as men of war; that they were better acquainted with preaching and praying than with fighting; and,



therefore, they thought they might venture to look them in the face, with weapons in their hands, and their idol before them.

Be this as it may, we are informed by Limborch, who gives the Popish historians Bzovius and Raynaldus as his authors, that the vast army of the cross-bearers, "every where attacked the heretics, took their cities, filled all places with slaughter and blood, and burnt many whom they had taken captives. For, in the year 1209, Buerre was taken by them, and all, without any regard to age, cruelly put to the sword, and the city itself destroyed by flames. Cæsarius tells us, that when the city was taken, the cross-bearers knew that there were several Catholics mixed with the heretics; and, when they were in doubt how to act, lest the Catholics should be slain, or the heretics feign themselves Catholics, Arnold, Abbot of Cisteaux, made answer, *slay them all, for the Lord knows who are his*; whereupon the soldiers slew them all without exception.

"Carcassone also was destroyed; and by the common consent of the prelates and barons, Simon, Earl of Montfort, of the bastard race of Robert, king of France, (whom Patavius in his *Ration. temp.* calls a man as truly religious as valiant) was made governor of the whole country, both of what was already conquered, and what was to be conquered for the future. The same year he took several cities and reduced them to his own obedience. He cruelly treated his captive heretics, and put them to death by the most horrible punishments. In the city of Castres two were condemned to the flames, and when a certain person declared he would abjure his heresy, the cross-bearers were divided among themselves: some contended that he ought not to be put to death; others said, it was plain he had been a heretic, and that his abjuration was not sincere, but proceeded only from his fear of immediate death. Earl Montfort consented that he should be burnt; alleging, that if his conversion was real, the fire would expiate his sins; if otherwise, he would receive a just reward of his perfidiousness. In other places also, they raged with the like cruelty. One Robert who had been of the sect of the Albigenses, and afterwards joined himself to the Dominicans, supported by the authority of the princes and magistrates, burnt all who persisted in their heresy; so that within two or three months he caused fifty persons, without distinction of sex, either to be buried alive or burnt; from whence he gained the name of the Hammer of the Heretics. Raynold affirms, that it ought not to be doubted, but that Pope Innocent appointed him to this office. At Paris, one Bernard, with nine others, of whom four were priests, the followers of Almerick, were apprehended; and being all had into a field, were degraded before the whole clergy and people, and burnt in the presence of the king.

"The year following, there was undertaken a new expedition of the cross-bearers against the Albigenses. They seized on Alby,

and there put many to death. They took la Vaur by force, and burnt in it great numbers of the Albigenses. They hanged Aymerrick the governor of the city, who was of a very noble family. They beheaded eighty of lesser degree, and did not spare the very women. They threw Girarda, Aymerick's sister, and the chief lady of that people, into an open pit, and covered her with stones. Afterwards they conquered Carcum, and put to death sixty men. They also seized on Pulchra Vallis, a large city near Tholouse and burnt in it four hundred Albigenses, and hanged fifty more. They took Castres de Termes, and in it Raymond de Termis, whom they put in prison, where he died; and burnt, in one large fire, his wife, sister, and virgin daughter, with some other noble ladies, when they could not persuade them, by promises or threats, to embrace the faith of the church of Rome." *Hist. Inq. chap. xi.*

All this fury and massacre would not do. It was found impossible to extirpate the professors of a more scriptural faith than Rome professed. The Pope, therefore, "pressed the Inquisition as the most effectual remedy for the extirpation of heretics. Bzovius relates, that at this time many heretics were burnt in Germany, France, and Italy, and that in this year (1215,) no less than 80 persons were apprehended at once in the city of Strasburg, of whom, but a very few were declared innocent. If any of these denied their heresy, friar Conrad of Marpurg, an apostolical inquisitor of the order of predicants, put them to the trial of the fire ordeal, and as many of them as were burnt by the iron, he delivered over to the secular power to be burnt as heretics; so that all who were accused and put to this trial, a few excepted, were condemned to the flames." *Ibid.*

These facts are given as an introduction to the subject of the Inquisition, which will come more into view in some of my future Numbers. This is a subject which modern Papists do not like to say much about. They would rejoice if all the histories which record the monstrous cruelties of their holy mother, were consigned to the flames. This, however, they cannot accomplish; and as the next best shift, they affect to discredit every historian who has written on the subject. In my thirteenth Number, I gave some strong facts from Limborch's History of the Inquisition; and in discussing the subject of not keeping faith with heretics, I had occasion to refer to the same author. In reference to this, "The Catholic Vindicator," "by one dash of his pen," abolishes his authority as an author, in the following manner:—"This Limborch, whom THE PROTESTANT here quotes, was minister of Gouda, and died in 1712. In religion he was half a Calvinist, and half a Socinian. He was the author of several works; and in his 'Complete Course of Divinity,' he shows himself as inconsistent in argument, as his quoter; for he therein rejects all tradition, but when he comes to distinguish the canonical books of Scripture from the

apocryphal ones, he is obliged to have recourse to the very rule which he himself rejects." *Cath. Vind.* No. X. These circumstances; it seems, invalidate the authority of Limborch as a historian; and though he does not profess to give any thing upon his own authority; but gives the names of *Popish* authors, with the titles and pages of their works, in which his facts are recorded, all must go for nothing, because he was not very decided in his doctrinal opinions, and because there was some inconsistency in his mode of ascertaining the canonical books of Scripture. This is modern *Popish* logic! Limborch gives hundreds of well-attested facts, in the very words of great *Popish* authors, with reference in every instance to the works from which he quotes; but our modern *Papists* will not believe a word of such quotations, because Limborch was half a Calvinist, and half a Socinian, &c. There must be some wonderful virtue in the pen, or in the ink of a heretic, seeing he possesses the power of imparting a new meaning to the words of *Popish* authors, without altering a letter or a point; and seeing he can render facts untrue, by merely transplanting the words which assert them into his pages; and that, while they still remain true, in the pages of those who originally recorded what they saw and heard. For the satisfaction of the reader, however, I shall give here the character of Limborch, by a living author, of at least equal authority with the "*Catholic Vindicator*."

"He was a native of Amsterdam, born in 1633, a person of great learning and talents, which raised him to the rank of professor of divinity in that city. When his *History of the Inquisition* first came over to England, it was received with the highest approbation by many of the principal nobility and clergy. In particular, Mr. Locke, that incomparable judge of men and books, bestowed the strongest eulogiums upon it,—commends it for its method and perspicuity, and the authorities with which it is so abundantly confirmed, and pronounces it to be a work of its kind absolutely perfect. In a letter to Limborch himself, he tells him, that he had so fully exposed their secret arts of wickedness, that if the *Papists* had any remains of humanity in them, they must be ashamed of their horrid tribunals, in which every thing that was just and right, was so monstrously perverted; and, that it was proper it should be translated into the vulgar language of every nation, that the meanest people might understand the antichristian practices of that execrable court. The *Papists* became so alarmed at its publication, that the cardinals, inquisitors general at Rome, condemned it by an edict, and forbade the reading of it under the severest penalties." *Jones' Hist. Wald.* 1st ed. p. 399.



THE

# Protestant,

No. CXXV.

---

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2d, 1820.

---

My last Number exhibited a sample of the manner in which the *holy* Roman church endeavoured to extirpate heresy. Fire and sword were the instruments employed for the purpose of compelling men to believe as the church believed; and not individuals or families only, but whole cities were put to the sword, if there were to be found, within their walls, any who would not assent and consent, to all the impiety and nonsense, which his holiness was pleased to impose upon them as matter of faith and Christian worship. Scotland and England suffered not a little at the period of their reformation, from the violence of the agents of Rome, who had still authority among the people; but, all that was suffered in this island, appears as nothing in comparison of what the Waldenses and Albigenses were called to suffer, long before the reformation under Luther was effected. It was determined by the holy see, to hunt them down, and destroy them as "venomous adders;" and the provinces and cities in which any of them were to be found were exposed to all the horrors of military execution.

Hundreds of thousands of armed men, called pilgrims or cross-bearers, were let loose upon the provinces and cities in which heretics were supposed to reside. They were under the command of men devoted to Popery, and ready to lay the world in ruins, if they could, for the aggrandizement of the holy see. The army of the crusaders was indeed under the command of clergymen, who seemed to have in view nothing less than the universal subjection of the human mind, to the will and pleasure of the holy church; and any individual who refused to be so subjected, was instantly

destroyed as not fit to live longer on this earth, which the Pope claimed as his own, in virtue of an imaginary grant to his great predecessor St. Peter.

In my last Number I mentioned the melancholy fate of the city of Beziers, the whole inhabitants of which were put to the sword, Papists and all, because the besieging army could not distinguish between the heretics and the faithful, and because the Abbot of Cisteaux commanded to kill them all, for the Lord knew them that were his. A short historical sketch of what followed thereon, will be interesting to the reader, as furnishing a view of the manner in which the church of Rome was wont to defend and propagate the faith.

“The earl of Beziers, foreseeing the ruin which awaited his capital, made his escape, and withdrew to the neighbouring city of Carcassone. This place was much more strongly fortified, both by nature and art, than Beziers, and consequently more defensible. The city, or upper town, stands upon a hill, surrounded by a double wall; the lower town, or borough, is in the plain, about two miles distant from the city. Numbers of the Albigenes resided there, and many more fled to it for security. The young earl, who had now been fully instructed, by the horrible proceedings at Beziers, into the motives and determinations of the Catholics, resolved, as far as was practicable, to defend Carcassone.” —“He, therefore, urged the inhabitants to defend themselves like men, and to recollect that both their lives and the free exercise of their religion was at stake, pledging himself that he would never forsake them in so honourable a cause, as was that of defending themselves against their common enemies, who under the mask of dissembled piety, were, in effect, nothing better than thieves and robbers.”

In the meantime, says my author, Jones, in his History of the Waldenses, the army of the crusaders had been augmented by the arrival of the fresh levies from every part of France, as well as from Italy and Germany, to upwards of three hundred thousand men, some writers make them five hundred thousand. Here we have a half, or on a more moderate calculation, one third of a million of armed men, gathered together against one city, to destroy it, because it contained a number of persons who did not believe in transubstantiation, or in the efficacy of the mass sacrifice; and because they chose to worship God rather as he taught them in his own word, than as the Pope dictated. This is Popery, appearing in its genuine character; and I request my readers to look at it, and to say what they think of the religion which was so occupied upon a large scale, not to save men's lives but to destroy them. The pilgrims, or cross-bearers, had hard work in besieging Carcassone, notwithstanding they had the Pope's legate as their com-

mander. They met with so violent a repulse, that the ground was covered with their dead bodies round about the city. The following day the legate ordered the scaling ladders to be applied, and a general assault to be made on the town, but the inhabitants made a resolute defence. They were, however, at length, overpowered with numbers, and beat back from the walls, when the enemy entered, and gave the inhabitants of the borough exactly the same treatment they had lately done to those of Beziers, *putting them all to the sword*. This, no doubt, was for the glory of God, and in defence of the true faith !

The city, or upper town, however, was yet secure, but the besieging army lost no time in proceeding to its reduction. The legate commanded them to play all their engines of war against it, and to take it by assault. But he had the mortification to see his soldiers of the cross fall by thousands,—the ground covered, and the ditches filled with the bodies of his pilgrims. The king of Arragon who was in the legate's or rather the Pope's army of pilgrims, who fought under the assurance that the gates of paradise would open to receive them, if they fell in this holy warfare, undertook to negotiate with the young earl of Beziers, who was himself a Papist, but did not like to see his subjects murdered because they were not Papists. The king endeavoured to persuade the earl to surrender, but without success. The earl acknowledged to the king, that many of his subjects possessed a faith very different from that of the Church of Rome, but they were persons who never did wrong or injury to any one, and in requital of their good services to himself, he was resolved never to desert them. This is a sufficient reply to those modern Popish writers, who represent the Waldenses and Albigenses as seditious persons, and as not fit to live under a regular government. The fact is, they were the quiet of the land wherever they resided. They were good neighbours and good subjects, as their sovereign here testifies ; and it does not appear that on any occasion they took up arms, except at the command of their sovereign, or when they were driven to extremities by their unrelenting persecutors.

It was expected by the besieging army, that the city of Carcasone would ultimately be obliged to surrender to the immense host that surrounded it ; and though, as yet, there was no appearance of this, the commander of the holy pilgrims, professing to be influenced by the intercession of the king of Arragon, offered the following terms of capitulation to the city, which are highly characteristic of such a band of holy Roman cross-bearers :—That the earl himself “ should be permitted to come out of the city, and to bring with him a dozen more, with their bag and baggage. But with regard to the rest of the inhabitants, they should not leave the



city, except at his discretion, of which they ought to entertain the most favourable opinion, *because he was the Pope's legate*: That all the inhabitants, both men, women, maidens, and children, should come forth without so much as their shirts or shifts on, or the smallest covering to hide their nakedness." Such was the discretion of the Pope's legate, of which all men were called upon to have the most favourable opinion, because he held that high office.

"The Spanish monarch was fully persuaded, that propositions so degrading as these were, it was needless to offer to the earl of Beziers; he, nevertheless, complied with the legate's request, and submitted them to the earl, who gave an immediate reply that he would never quit the city upon conditions so dishonourable and unjust, and that he was resolved to defend both himself and his subjects, by every means that God had put within his power.

"Finding himself thus foiled in his attempt to move the earl of Beziers, the legate soon had recourse to a less honourable, but more deep laid plot. He insinuated himself into the graces of one of the officers of his army, telling him that it lay in his power to render to the church a signal instance of kindness, and that if he would undertake it, besides the rewards which he would receive in heaven, he should be amply recompensed on earth. The object was, to get access to the earl of Beziers, professing himself to be his kinsman and friend, assuring him that he had something to communicate of the last importance to his interests, and, having thus far succeeded, he was to prevail upon him to accompany him to the legate, for the purpose of negotiating a peace, under a pledge that he would be safely conducted back again to the city. The officer played his part so dexterously, that the earl imprudently consented to accompany him. At their interview, the latter submitted to the legate, the propriety of exercising a little more lenity and moderation towards his subjects, as a procedure that might have the happiest tendency in reducing the Albigenses into the Church of Rome; he also stated to him, that the conditions which had been formerly proposed to him, were dishonourable and shameful, and highly indecorous in those whose eyes ought to be as chaste as their thoughts; that his people would rather choose to die than submit to such disgraceful treatment. The legate replied, that the inhabitants of Carcassone might exercise their own pleasure; but that it was now unnecessary for the earl to trouble himself any farther about them, as he was himself a prisoner until Carcassone was taken, and his subjects had better learnt their duty.

"The earl was not a little astonished at this information—protested that he was betrayed, and that faith was violated; for that the gentleman, by whose entreaties he had been prevailed

upon to meet the legate, had pledged himself by oaths and execrations to conduct him back in safety to Carcassone. But appeals, remonstrances, or entreaties, were of no avail; he was committed to the custody of the duke of Burgundy, and having been thrown into prison, died soon after, not without great suspicion of having been poisoned.

“No sooner had the inhabitants of Carcassone received the intelligence of the earl’s confinement, than they burst into tears, and were seized with such terror, that they thought of nothing but how to escape the danger they were then placed in; but blocked up as they were on all sides, and the trenches filled with men, all human probability of escape vanished from their eyes. A report, however, was circulated, that there was a vault or subterraneous passage somewhere in the city, which led to the castle of Caberet, a distance of about three leagues from Carcassone, and that if the mouth or entry thereof could be found, providence had provided for them a way of escape. All the inhabitants of the city, except those who kept watch upon the rampires, immediately commenced the search, and success rewarded their labour. The entrance of the cavern was found, and at the beginning of the night they all commenced their journey through it, carrying with them only as much food as was deemed necessary to serve them for a few days. It was a dismal and sorrowful sight, says their historian, to witness their removal and departure, accompanied with sighs, tears, and lamentations, at the thoughts of quitting their habitations and all their worldly possessions, and betaking themselves to the uncertain event of saving themselves by flight; parents leading their children, and the more robust supporting decrepit old persons; and especially to hear the affecting lamentations of the women. They, however, arrived the following day at the castle, from whence they dispersed themselves through different parts of the country, some proceeding to Arragon, some to Catalonia, others to Tholouse and the cities belonging to their party, wherever God in his providence opened a way for their admission.”—*Jones’ Hist. Wald. ch. v. sect. vi.*

Here we have a view of Popery in all its glory. Provinces laid waste, and cities destroyed, marked the triumph of the successor of St. Peter and the vicar of Christ. “The reader, who has never had an opportunity of exploring the history of this period, can scarcely conceive the scenes of baseness, perfidy, barbarity, indecency, and hypocrisy, over which Pope Innocent presided. The bare reflection of three hundred thousand men, actuated by motives of avarice and superstition, filling the country of the Albigenses with carnage and confusion, during a period of twenty years, is, in itself, sufficient to harrow up the soul; but to go into a circumstantial detail of all the multifarious atrocities which belong

to it, would only be to impose upon the reader an obligation to throw aside the book, from a regard to his own feelings."—*Ibid.*

Some of these atrocities must, however, be brought to view before I have done, in order to show the reader the true character of Popery. I would not insist so much upon this, if our modern Papists would confess the truth, and acknowledge the faults of their predecessors. But when they maintain that their religious system has undergone no change, since it urged on their fathers to kill, destroy, and cause to perish, all who presumed to believe and worship as they learned from the Bible; and since they maintain that their religion is unchangeable, and infallible, and, therefore, incapable of having improved in the smallest degree, I do them no injustice when I lay the crimes of Innocent III. and of his army of priests at the door of Pius VII. and his host of clergy, whose principles being confessedly the same with those of Innocent, in every particular, their practice would also be the same, were it not for providential restraints, by which they are prevented from murdering heretics by thousands at a time, as was done formerly, as if it had been a mere matter of amusement.

"In the course of the war," says Jones, in the same section, "the castle of Minerva having surrendered at discretion, the Abbe Cisteau, who, ever since the election of Montfort to the command of the army, had continued the chief counsellor of the crusaders, hesitated for some time, how he should dispose of the garrison and inhabitants. He sincerely desired the death of the enemies of Christ, says the author of the History of the Albigenses, but being a priest and a monk, he could not agree to the slaughter of the citizens, if they would be converted. Robert Mauvoisin, a zealot in the army, dissatisfied with this appearance of humanity and condescension, insisted that they had come there, not to favour heretics, but to exterminate them. In this dilemma, the blood-thirsty monk was relieved from his embarrassment, by the higher tone, not the fiercer spirit of a third person, who exclaimed, 'fear not, probably not one of them will accept of the alternative!' The event proved the correctness of his judgment, for the piles being kindled, they generally precipitated themselves into the flames." They chose to suffer the most cruel death, rather than to wound their consciences, and dishonour God, by being converted to the faith of Rome. And that they made a wise choice, no one will deny, who understands the import of Christ's words, "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it:" and, even if we should take lower ground than this, we may be convinced that they made a wise choice; for had they professed to be converted, they would have been put to death in order to prevent a relapse, and that they might have the happiness of dying in the holy faith of the Pope.



Thus they would have incurred the curse of having denied Christ before men, and they would have suffered the scorn and the cruelty of men into the bargain.

“ But, independent of those who fell by the edge of the sword, or were committed to the flames by the soldiers and magistrates, the Inquisition was constantly at work, from the year 1206 to 1228, and produced the most dreadful havoc among the disciples of Christ. Of the effects occasioned by this infernal engine of cruelty and oppression, we may have some notion from this circumstance,—that in the last mentioned year the archbishops of Aix, Arles, and Narbonne, found it necessary to intercede with the monks of the Inquisition, to defer a little their work of imprisonment, until the Pope was apprised of the immense numbers apprehended—numbers so great, that it was impossible to defray the charge of their subsistence, or even to provide stone and mortar to build prisons for them. Their own language, indeed, is so remarkable, that it deserves to be laid before the reader, and here it is:—‘ It has come to our knowledge, say they, that you have apprehended so many of the Waldenses, that it is not only impossible to defray the charge of their subsistence, but also to provide stone and mortar to build prisons for them. We, therefore, advise you to defer for a while augmenting their numbers, until the Pope be apprised of the great multitudes that have been apprehended, and until he notify what he pleases to have done in this case. Nor is there any reason you should *take offence* hereat; for as to those who are altogether impenitent and incorrigible, or concerning whom you may doubt of their relapse or escape, or that, being at large again, they would infect others, *you may condemn such without delay.*’ Such is the representation given us, by writers of unimpeachable veracity, of the merciless treatment which the Albigenses received from the Catholics of this period, purely on account of their religious profession.”—*Hist. Wald. ch. v. sect. vi.* It is computed, that, in the first twenty years of the thirteenth century, not less than a million of persons were put to death, by command of the pretended vicar of Christ; solely because they would not believe and worship according to the standard which he had set up. See *Mede on the Apocalypse*, p. 503. and *Newton on the Prophecies*, referred to by Jones, *Hist. Wald.* How justly is the church of Rome, this mother of abominations, represented as drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus! Rev. xvii. 6. For these things more in detail, and a great deal more to the same purpose, I refer to Jones’ *History of the Waldenses*, and Sir Samuel Moreland’s *History of the Evangelical churches in Piedmont.*

The last mentioned author was English Ambassador at Geneva, at the time of a most horrible massacre of the Protestants in

the valleys of Piedmont, the descendants of the Waldenses, which took place in the year 1655. He gives a translation of a long letter, written by "some of the poor distressed Protestants" in these valleys, which exhibits such a picture of Popish cruelty on the one hand, and patient suffering on the other, as have scarcely been paralleled since the time of the persecution of the Christians by the Roman emperors. The letter begins thus:—"Brethren and fathers, our tears are no more tears of water but of blood, which do not only drown and obscure our sight, but even oppress our very hearts. Our pen is guided by a trembling hand; our brains are made dry by the many knocks we have received, and our mind so exceedingly troubled by such unexpected and sudden alarms, that we are not able to form a letter answerable to the intent of our minds, and the strangeness of our desolations." In the course of the narrative we read as follows: The persecuted people, having no way to flee or save themselves, were most fearfully massacred and put to death. "In one place they cruelly tormented no less than a hundred and fifty women and small children, and afterwards chopped off the heads of some, and dashed the brains of others against the rocks. As for a great part of the prisoners which they took, from fifteen years of age and upwards, who refused to go to mass, they hanged some, and nailed the feet of others to trees, with their heads hanging towards the ground." "'Tis too evident that all is lost, since there are some whole communities, especially St. Giovanni, and La Torre, where the business of setting fire to our houses and churches was so dexterously managed by a Franciscan friar and a certain priest, that they left not so much as one of either, unburnt. In these desolations the mother was bereft of her sweet child, the husband of his dear wife. Those who were the richest among us, are forced to beg their bread; yea, what is worse, they are weltering in their own blood, and deprived of all the comforts of life."

I had some dreadful instances of cruelty to men, women, and children, which I intended for the conclusion of this Number; but I find I have not room for above one or two of them; and I think it better to forbear giving these by themselves. I wish to throw together, at once, what persons of weak nerves will not be able to read; and I intend to give them warning beforehand, that they may know when to stop.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXVI.

~~~~~  
*SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9th, 1820.*  
~~~~~

ON the subject of the Inquisition, materials are so abundant, that it is difficult to comprise the substance of them within reasonable bounds. If I were to give this subject alone the space which it might occupy, I should be obliged to continue my labours for many years beyond the period at which I expect them to terminate: but I wish my Popish readers to understand, that I have no intention of continuing to torment them, as long as they and I shall live. Greatly encouraged as I am, to persevere in my labours, by the extensive and long-continued approbation of the best judges in the three kingdoms, I must not write for ever; and, therefore, I feel it necessary to take but a comparatively slight glance at the history and character of the holy Inquisition.

“The growth of the Inquisition was very gradual, and it is difficult to say when it commenced. Its advocates make it as old as the Mosaic dispensation, and represent Moses himself, and his successor Joshua, as having exercised the functions of Inquisitors-general. We must, however, look for the origin of the modern Inquisition in the persecutions excited by Innocent III. about the beginning of the thirteenth century, against the Albigenses. Honorius III. who succeeded Innocent, gave it a more regular form, and committed the superintendence of the system to Dominic de Gusman, commonly called St. Dominic. Dominic founded an order of monks, and another of nuns, which are still continued under the name of Dominicans. He instituted also a third lay order, called “Militia Christi,” the members of which have since been designated, Familiars of the Holy Office. Gregory IX. confirmed all that had previously been done, and committed the charge of the Inquisition to the Dominican friars, and in their absence to the Franciscans. Hitherto the Inquisition had extended



only to Italy and France, but during the pontificate of Gregory, it was introduced into the Christian kingdoms of Spain, (meaning those parts of Spain in which Christianity was professed, in distinction from those possessed by the Moors;) and the Dominicans of that country soon found an ample field for the exercise of their office, among the Jewish and Moorish proselytes, whom interest or fear had drawn within the pale of the Catholic church. From this period the institution went on increasing in extent and activity till the year 1492, when Ferdinand and Isabella became sovereigns of all Spain. During their reign, it became the subject of much controversy between the courts of Spain and Rome. Isabella, a woman of considerable talents, appears to have foreseen the encroachments which the Inquisition would make upon the royal prerogatives, but her resistance was overruled; and in 1482, the famous Torquemada was appointed Inquisitor-general of Castile. In the succeeding year, his commission was extended to Aragon; and following the successes of Ferdinand and Isabella, he successively planted the Inquisition in the Moorish kingdoms of Seville, Cordona, Jaen, and Villa Real. The Inquisition thus established, continued in force till the invasion of Spain, by Bonaparte, and has latterly, with some reformatons, been re-established under the auspices of Ferdinand VII." *See a well written article in the Literary and Statistical Magazine for March last, entitled, "Sketches of the Spanish Inquisition."* Since the above was published, Ferdinand has been obliged to retrace his steps, and again to abolish the Inquisition in Spain.

Heresy was the offence for the discovery and punishment of which this dreadful tribunal was instituted. But heresy was a thing so undefined in its nature, that it was easy to make the law against it apply to any thought that might pass through a man's mind, if that thought came to be revealed;—much more to any action of a man's life, or any word that he might speak. If a man think at all, his thoughts must have some relation to the things of time or of eternity. The holy church, of course, the holy Inquisition, professed to have unlimited jurisdiction over all words and thoughts relating to eternity; and they so explained the connection between temporal and eternal things, as to bring the former also under their cognizance; so that they actually obtained absolute dominion over the human mind, body, and estate. "Most offences were left to the cognizance of the secular tribunals," says the writer of the article above referred to, "but if a suspicion existed, that the offence had been committed under a persuasion of its not being criminal, this justified the interference of the holy office. As branches of heresy, the Inquisition examined all cases of blasphemy, divination, witchcraft, schism; and, even those who conversed with, or harboured heretics, were considered as justly suspected of heresy themselves. The breach of the vow

of chastity, bigamy, and crimes against nature, were all supposed to imply a perversion of faith. At one period, the sale of Spanish horses to the French was considered as heresy, because the French were Huguenots, and would probably use the said horses against the interests of the Catholic church. Moors and Jews, who had embraced Christianity, and relapsed into their former errors, were classed among heretics; and, even if they had made no such profession, yet if, by word or deed, they made any attempt to shake the faith of any Christian, the Inquisition took cognizance of the offence. Even death, which is generally supposed to put its victims out of the reach of human molestation, was unable to arrest the march of the Inquisition. Processes which had begun, were never suspended by the death of the accused; and accusations were received, even against those who, during their lives, had maintained a fair character for orthodoxy. In either case, if the charges were proved, the corpse of the accused was burned by the common executioner, his memory devoted to infamy, and what was more important, his goods were forfeited to the holy office."

This tribunal was invested with all the power that it is possible for the strong to possess over the weak. I speak of its power, not as consisting so much in its physical strength, though in many places that was not small, but rather as consisting in the influence which it had over the minds of a superstitious people. The Inquisitors assumed, and they had silently conceded to them, absolute dominion over every soul within their jurisdiction, without being obliged to account to the civil powers for what they did with the persons and the property of the many thousands who fell under their displeasure, who were immured in dungeons, and never again heard of by their relatives or neighbours; some of whom perished in darkness and despair; others were privately tortured to death; and not a few publicly committed to the flames, for the amusement and edification of such faithful children of the church, as had never been suspected of heretical pravity.

The word Inquisition, or Inquisitorial, has come into proverbial use, as denoting any thing that combines injustice, cruelty, perfidy, and cunning; and the Inquisition became so identified with the Church of Rome, that it is vain for modern Papists to attempt to clear their holy mother of the guilt of the misery which that tribunal has inflicted on the world for six hundred years. It is in full operation at this day in some parts of the world; and the abolition of it in Spain, within the present year, is no evidence that Popery has become more humane; but only that some enlightened men, who happily have got the direction of public affairs, are beginning to see the evil of Romish superstition and domination, as is farther evident by the suppression of the monasteries in that kingdom.

It is difficult for the inhabitants of this country, long accustomed to freedom, and the administration of equitable laws, to imagine the anguish and despair which Popery inflicted upon many an innocent family, by means of the Inquisition. It was in the power of any miscreant, who conceived a hatred of his neighbour, to lodge a complaint, or insinuate a suspicion of heresy against him; and the same night the unsuspecting victim of malice was dragged from his family, confined to prison, and perhaps tortured to death, while his wife and children remained ignorant of his fate, as well as of the crime laid to his charge; and durst not inquire, lest the holy office should lay its merciless paw upon them also. And even, when there was not so much as a suspicion of heresy, it was usual to invent accusations against persons in order to obtain possession of their property. If the holy fathers took a fancy to a young lady, or to a married woman, it was their custom to send, at the dead hour of night, to tear them away from the bosom of their families: the husband was obliged to surrender his wife, and the father his daughter, without daring to whisper a complaint, or ever after to inquire what had become of those who were so dear to him; and neighbours durst not so much as remark that such persons were amissing, lest some spy of the holy office should inform against them, and they be brought to share the same fate.

Under the pretext of labouring to suppress heresy, the holy Inquisition was found to make war, not against true religion only, but also against what is demonstrably true in philosophy and science. We have a striking example of this in the case of Galileo, the first mathematician and astronomer of his age, who, if not the original inventor of the telescope, was the first that applied it to any valuable purpose in the science of astronomy. From a careful observation of the motions of the heavenly bodies, Galileo became a convert to the system of Copernicus, or what is now called the Newtonian system, having been, by Sir Isaac Newton, demonstrated to be the true system of the universe; that is, that the sun is the centre of motion to a number of planets, and the earth among the rest, which revolve round the sun at different periods, in proportion to their respective distances. I suppose there is scarcely a peasant in Scotland in the present day, who has studied the subject, who is not convinced of the truth of the system thus described; and yet, for daring to teach it, Galileo was in danger of being burnt to death.

The process against the philosopher is given by Limberch at great length, and copied from him by subsequent writers. I shall give here the substance of it. It would occupy too much space to give the indictment verbatim; but when I come to the philosopher's recantation, I shall give it without abridgment. The names of certain great ecclesiastical dignitaries are given as sitting in



judgment upon the poor astronomer, and his libel runs in the following strain:—

Whereas, you Galileus, of Florence, aged 70, were informed against in the year 1615, in this holy office, for maintaining as true, a certain false doctrine, held by many, viz. that the sun is the centre of the world, and immoveable, and that the earth moves round it with a daily motion. Likewise, that you have certain scholars to whom you have taught the same doctrine. Likewise, that you have kept up a correspondence with certain German mathematicians concerning the same. Likewise, that you have published certain letters concerning the solar spots, in which you have explained the same doctrine as true, and that you have answered the objections which in several places were made against you, from the authority of the holy Scriptures, by construing or glossing over the said Scriptures, according to your own opinions. And finally, whereas the copy of a writing under the form of a letter, reported to have been written by you to one who was formerly your scholar, has been shown to us, in which you have followed the hypothesis of Copernicus, which contains certain propositions contrary to the true sense and authority of the holy Scriptures.

Now, this holy tribunal, being desirous to provide against the inconveniences and dangers which this statement may occasion, to the detriment of the holy faith, by the command of the most eminent lords, cardinals, &c. of this supreme and universal Inquisition, have caused the two following propositions concerning the immoveability of the sun, and the motion of the earth, to be thus qualified by the divines, viz.

“That the sun is the centre of the world and immoveable, with a local motion, is an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, and absolutely heretical, because it is expressly contrary to the holy Scriptures.

“That the earth is neither the centre of the world nor immoveable, but that it possesses a daily motion, is likewise an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, and, theologically considered, at least erroneous in point of faith.

“But as it pleased us in the first instance to proceed kindly with you, it was decreed in the said congregation, held before our lord N. Feb. 25, anno 1616, that the most eminent lord cardinal Bellarmine, should command you, that you should entirely depart from the said false doctrine, and in case you should refuse to obey him, that you should be commanded by the commissary of the holy office, to abandon the same, and that you should neither teach it to others, defend it, nor say any thing concerning it, and that, if you should not submit to this order, you should be put in gaol,” &c. &c. Thus, for merely entertaining and expressing an opinion with regard to the system of the universe, was the

greatest philosopher of his age, subjected to be imprisoned in the gaol of the Inquisition, which imprisonment almost necessarily inferred the forfeiture of life by means of burning; and if the holy Inquisitors, in their great mercy, were pleased not to burn him to death, the circumstance of being imprisoned by them necessarily inferred the forfeiture of all his property, and the consigning of his name to infamy. The opinion which the holy fathers condemned happens to be true in philosophy, and not contrary to Scripture, for the word of God is occupied about higher matters, and does not pronounce any decision upon a subject so unimportant as the structure of the universe; but supposing the doctrine, that the earth moves round the sun, and not the sun round the earth, to be false in philosophy, what right had the Church of Rome to imprison, and commit men to the flames for believing it? The error was not greater, than to maintain that two and three make six; and truly that must be a *holy office* that will burn men to death for such a harmless opinion.

After a long round-about account of the errors of Galileo's writings, their condemnation of the same, and their dealings with the unhappy author in order to his recantation, the holy fathers proceed as follows:—

“ Invoking, therefore, the most holy name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his most glorious mother, Mary, ever a virgin, we do, by this our definitive sentence, which, sitting in our tribunal, we pronounce in these writings, with the advice and judgment of the reverend masters, doctors of divinity, and both laws, with whom we have consulted concerning the cause and causes now depending before us, between the magnificent Carolus Sincerus, doctor of both laws, and procurator of the exchequer of this holy office of the one part, and you Galileus Galilei, a criminal here under the power of the Inquisition, by this present written process, examined and confessed as above, of the other part; We do say, judge, and declare, that you the aforesaid Galileus have, upon account of those things, which are produced in the written process, and which you have confessed as above, subjected yourself to a strong suspicion of heresy in this holy office, by believing and holding to be true, a doctrine which is false and contrary to the sacred and divine Scripture; viz. that the sun is the centre of the orb of the earth, and does not move from the east to the west; and that the earth moves, and is not the centre of the world, and that these things may be considered and defended as probable opinions, although they have been declared and determined to be contrary to the sacred Scripture; and consequently, that you have incurred all the censures and penalties appointed and promulgated by the sacred canons, and other general and particular acts against such offenders; from which it is our pleasure that you should be absolved, provided that you do first, with a sincere heart, and a

true faith, abjure, curse, and detest, before us, the aforesaid errors and heresies, and every other error and heresy contrary to the catholic and apostolic Roman church, in the form which shall be prescribed to you by us." Then follows the formal condemnation and prohibition of Galileo's book, with an injunction of suitable penance, such as the holy fathers should please to inflict upon the miserable author, who happened, unfortunately for himself, to know more of God's works of creation, than the Church of Rome chose that any man should know. The deed, if given at length, would nearly fill one of my Numbers; it is subscribed by no less than seven cardinals; and it shows what must have been the low state of learning and science in Europe, only two hundred years ago. The following is the abjuration, which I give at full length, though the substance of it might have been expressed in half the number of words:

"I, Galileus, son of the late Vincentius Galileus, a Florentine, aged 70, being here personally upon my trial, and on my knees before you, the most learned and eminent the lords, cardinals, inquisitors-general of the universal Christian commonwealth, against heretical wickedness, and having before my eyes the most holy gospels, which I touch with my proper hands, do swear that I always have believed, and do now believe, and by the aid of God I will in future believe, every thing which the holy catholic and apostolic Roman church doth hold, preach, and teach. But whereas, notwithstanding, after I had been legally enjoined and commanded by this holy office, to abandon wholly that false opinion, which maintains that the sun is the centre of the universe, and immoveable, and that I should not hold, defend, or in any way, either by word or writing, teach the aforesaid false doctrine; and whereas, also, after it had been notified to me, that the aforesaid doctrine was contrary to the holy Scripture, I wrote and published a book, in which I treated of the doctrine which had been condemned, and produced reasons of great force in favour of it, without giving any answers to them, for which I have been judged by the holy office to have incurred a strong suspicion of heresy, viz. for believing that the sun is the centre of the world, and that the earth is not the centre, but moves. Being, therefore, willing to remove from the minds of your eminences, and of every catholic Christian, this strong suspicion which has been legally conceived against me, I do, with a sincere heart, and a true faith, abjure, curse, and detest, not only the foresaid errors and heresies, but generally every other error and opinion which may be contrary to the aforesaid holy church; and I swear, that, for the future, I will never more say or assert, either by word or writing, any thing that shall give occasion for a like suspicion; but that if I should know any heretic, or person suspected of heresy, I will inform against him to this holy office, or to the inquisitor, or ordinary of the



place, in which I shall then be. Moreover, I swear and promise, that I will fulfil and fully observe all the penances which have been, or shall be hereafter enjoined me by this holy office. But if which God forbid, it should happen that I should act contrary to my word, promises, protestations, and oaths, I do hereby subject myself to all the penalties and punishments which have been ordained and published against such offenders by the sacred canons and other acts, both general and particular. So help me God, and these holy gospels which I now touch with my own proper hand. I, the above mentioned Galileus Galilei, have abjured, sworn, promised, and bound myself as above, and in testimony of these things I have subscribed, with my own proper hand, this present instrument of my abjuration, and have repeated it word by word at Rome, in the convent of Minerva, this 22d day of July, anno 1633. I, Galileus Galilei, have abjured as above, with my own proper hand."

It must be admitted; that the great philosopher appears here in a contemptible light. He denies upon oath what he believes to be true. He had indeed no alternative between this and being burnt to death; and mere philosophy could not furnish him with a reason and a motive for laying down his life for her sake. Had he been actuated by Christian principle; he would rather have died than have sworn to a falsehood, though it had been in a matter of no more importance, than that two and three make five. But if the Philosopher appears contemptible in this matter, what shall we say of the holy Church of Rome, that imposed such a hardship upon the wisest of her children? She appears not only as the enemy of truth and righteousness, but also as the enemy of science and literature. Under her influence, men could have no heart for making discoveries of any kind. Had any man proposed in Italy 200 years ago, to light a city by means of an invisible substance extracted from pit-coal, he would have been suspected of heretical intercourse with the devil; and if he should have succeeded in his plan, as our Gas Light Company has done, he would have been thrown into one of his own retorts, or more publicly burnt at an Auto-de-fe, as a wizard, or convicted heretic at least. It is easier to conceive how He that made all things out of nothing, should make the earth to move round the sun, than that a fellow-creature should be able to bring light out of darkness. The things, however, are both alike true. The one is proved by experiment, the other by observation; but if we were under the dominion of Popery, we should be obliged to deny both upon oath, or submit to the alternative of being thrown into the fire.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXVII.

~~~~~  
*SATURDAY, DECEMBER 16th, 1820.*  
~~~~~

IN treating of the holy Inquisition, it is not necessary that I go minutely into the consideration of its constitution, the laws by which it is regulated, and the titles and functions of the officers by whom it is governed. A full account of these may be found in "Limborch's History of the Inquisition;"—"The History of the Inquisition as it subsists in the kingdoms of Spain and Portugal," by Baker; Dellon's Account of the Inquisition at Goa; and in the work of a late, and I suppose, living author, entitled, "A Narrative of the Persecution of Hippolyto Joseph da Costa Pereira Furtado de Mendoza," who was imprisoned and tried in Lisbon, by the Inquisition, about eighteen years ago, for the alleged crime of being a freemason. The narrative of this writer with regard to his own sufferings is highly interesting; but his account of the constitution and laws of the "Holy Office," is in a great measure a compilation from Limborch and others; and it ought to be mentioned, to the honour of the last mentioned author, that though he wrote about the middle of the 17th, his account is confirmed by the narrative of one who suffered in the Inquisition at the beginning of the 19th century.

But as my plan is to expose the cruelty and extreme wickedness of Popery, as these appear in the conduct of the sacred tribunal, I shall, in a great measure, confine myself to facts illustrative of what I assert. Let it be remembered, that the grand avowed object of the institution was the suppression of heresy; that is, to prevent any man from thinking and speaking about religion, except according to a fixed rule, laid down by the Church of Rome; and if any man would not be persuaded to think and speak according to this rule, it was the business of the holy office to deliver him up to the flames. But though this was the avowed

object of the Inquisition, it will appear in the sequel, that it was used by great luxurious ecclesiastics as a mean of providing for the gratification of their lusts. The grand Turk has not a more splendid Seraglio within the walls of his palace, than holy fathers are known to have kept within the prison of the Inquisition: and these very fathers would, without scruple, have sent any man of their own order to the flames, if he had presumed to commit the heresy of marrying, and living honestly with one woman.

About the beginning of the last century, there happened to be a sort of a civil war in Spain, in which the troops of the king of France were actively engaged on one side. In their victorious career they came into possession of the city of Zaragosa, in Aragon, in which were a number of convents, particularly one of Dominicans. The French commander, M. Legal, found it necessary to levy a pretty heavy contribution upon the inhabitants, not omitting the convents. The Dominicans, all whose friars were familiars of the holy Inquisition, excused themselves in a civil manner, saying, they had no money, and if M. de Legal insisted upon the demand of a thousand pistoles, which fell to their share, they could not pay him in any other way than by sending him the silver bodies of the saints. The friars imagined that the French commander would not have the heart to require such a sacrifice, and they thought, that if he should insist upon it, they would, by raising the cry of heresy against him, raise the mass of the people to take their part. The Frenchman, however, felt no qualms of conscience about the matter. He signified that the silver saints would be very welcome visitors. The friars, seeing they could not mend the matter, carried their gods to the governor, Legal, in a solemn procession, with lighted candles. The governor having heard that it was their intention to make a procession, and raise a mob, if they could, ordered out four companies of grenadiers, well armed, to receive the saints in the most devout and honourable manner; so that the design of raising the people completely failed. The saints were forthwith sent to the mint; and the holy fathers applied to the Inquisition to interpose its supreme power in order to save them from the furnace. This power was readily exercised in the way of excommunicating M. Legal. An instrument to this effect having been drawn up and signed, the secretary of the holy office was commanded to go and read it to the governor. Having performed his duty, the excommunicated governor, instead of expressing displeasure, with a mild countenance, took the paper from the secretary, and said, "Pray tell your masters, the Inquisitors, that I will answer them to-morrow morning."

The governor then ordered his secretary to draw a copy of the



excommunication, with the simple alteration of inserting "the holy Inquisitors," instead of his own name; and the next morning he ordered four regiments to be sent along with his secretary to the Inquisition, with command to read the excommunication to the Inquisitors themselves, and if they made the least noise, to turn them out, open all the prisons, and quarter two regiments there. The orders were obeyed; and the holy fathers were deeply amazed and confounded, to find themselves excommunicated by a man who had no authority for it; and they began a hue and cry against the governor as a heretic, and as having publicly insulted the Catholic faith. "Holy Inquisitors," said the secretary, "the king wants this house to quarter his troops in; so walk out immediately;" and having no alternative, they were compelled to obey. The doors of the prisons were thrown open; and then the wickedness of the Inquisitors was exposed to the world. Four hundred prisoners got liberty that day; and among them sixty well dressed young women, who were found to be the private property of the three Inquisitors, and of which they had robbed the families of the city and neighbourhood.

The archbishop, seriously concerned for the honour of the holy tribunal, desired M. Legal to send these women to his palace, promising that he would take care of them; and in the mean time, he published an ecclesiastical censure against all who should defame by groundless reports the holy office of the Inquisition; that is, all who should mention the fact thus come to light. The governor professed his willingness to comply with his grace's desire; but as to the young women, that was not in his power, for the French officers had hurried them all away, being glad to get such fine mistresses. In fact, they were chiefly young ladies, beautiful and accomplished, who had been forcibly carried away, at the pleasure of the holy fathers, from the most opulent families in the city, and who probably would never have been seen without the walls of the sacred building, but for such a deliverance as that which was effected by the French soldiers. Some of them were afterwards married to their deliverers, one of whom furnished Mr. Gavin, from whom I abridge this statement, with a narrative of her own case, which I am sure will be interesting to my readers. I shall give the substance of it, without adhering strictly to the author's phraseology, as I think I can give it in fewer words than he does. He having been bred a Papist, seems not to have been able, after his conversion, to lay aside the Popish verbose, round-about style of writing.

Travelling in France some time after the event above referred to, and after he had renounced his situation as a Popish priest, he met one of the ladies at Rochfort, in an inn where he happened to lodge. She was then the wife of the innkeeper's son, who had

been a lieutenant in the French service in Spain. Though she did not know Mr. Gavin in his secular habit, he recognized her as the daughter of counsellor Belabriga, in Zaragosa, with whose family he had been acquainted. Her father, it seems, had died of grief, after having lost her, without the comfort of revealing the cause of his trouble, even to his confessor ; so great was his dread of the Inquisition. From this lady Mr. Gavin obtained an account of the manner of her abduction, and of the treatment which she received in the holy office.

" I went one day, said she, with my mother to visit the countess of Attarass, and I met there, Don Francisco Torrejon, her confessor, and second Inquisitor. After we had drunk chocolate, he asked me my age, my confessor's name, and so many intricate questions about religion, that I could not answer him. His serious countenance frightened me ; and perceiving my fear, he desired the countess to tell me, that he was not so severe as I supposed, after which he caressed me very kindly. He gave me his hand, which I kissed with great respect and modesty ; and when he went away he told me, ' My dear child, I shall remember you till the next time.' I did not know what he meant, being quite unexperienced, and only fifteen years old. Indeed, he did remember me ; for that very night, when in bed, hearing a hard knocking at the door, the maid who lay in the room with me went to the window, and asking who was there ? I heard the reply, ' The holy Inquisition.' I could not forbear crying out, father, father, I am ruined for ever. My dear father got up, and inquiring what the matter was, I answered him with tears, the Inquisition ; he, for fear that the maid would not open the door so quickly as such a case required, went himself to open the door, and like another Abraham to offer his child to the fire ; and as I did not cease to cry out, my dear father, all in tears, stopped my mouth, to show his obedience to the holy office, for he supposed I had committed some crime against religion. The officers gave me time only to put on a petticoat and a mantle ; they took me into the coach ; and without allowing me the satisfaction of embracing my father and mother, they carried me into the Inquisition.

" I expected to die that night ; but when they carried me into a noble room, well furnished, I was quite surprised. The officers left me there, and immediately a maid came in with a salver of sweetmeats and cinnamon water, desiring me to take some refreshment before I went to bed. I told her I could not, but that I should be obliged to her, if she could tell me whether I was to die that night or not ? Die, said she, you do not come here to die, but to live like a princess, and you shall want for nothing in the world but the liberty of going out ; so be not afraid, but go

to bed, and sleep easy, for to-morrow you shall see wonders in this house ; and as I am chosen to be your waiting maid, I hope you will be kind to me. I was going to ask some questions, but she told me she had not leave to tell me any thing more till the next day, only nobody shall come to disturb you ; so she left me for a quarter of an hour. The great amazement I was in, took away the exercise of my senses to such a degree, that I could neither think of my parents nor my own dangerous situation. In this suspension of thought, the maid returned, and locked the chamber door after her. Madam, said she, let us go to bed, and be pleased to tell me at what time in the morning you will have the chocolate ready. I asked her name, and she told me it was Mary. Mary, said I, for God's sake, tell me, whether I come to die or not ? I have told you, Madam, said she, that you come to be one of the happiest ladies in the world. I went to bed, but the fear of death prevented me from shutting my eyes, so that I rose at break of day. Mary lay till 6 o'clock, and was surprised to find me up. She said little, but in half an hour she brought me, on a silver plate, two cups of chocolate and biscuits ; I drank one cup, and desired her to drink the other, which she did. Well, Mary, said I, can you give me any account of the reasons of my being here ? Not yet, Madam, said she ; have a little patience. With this answer she left me, and an hour after came again, with a fine Holland shift, a Holland under petticoat, finely laced round, two silk petticoats, and a little Spanish waistcoat, fringed all over with gold, and combs, and ribbons, and every thing suitable to a lady of higher quality than I ; but my greatest surprise was to see a gold snuff box, with the picture of Don Francisco Torrejon in it. Then I understood the meaning of my confinement. I considered with myself, that to refuse the present would be the occasion of my immediate death ; and that to accept it, was to give him too great encouragement against my honour. But I found, as I thought, a medium in the case ; so I said to Mary, Pray give my service to Don Francisco Torrejon, and tell him, that as I could not bring my clothes along with me last night, honesty permits me to receive what is necessary to keep me decent ; but since I do not take snuff, I beg his lordship to excuse me if I do not accept this box. Mary went to him with this answer, and came again with a picture, nicely set in gold, with four diamonds at the four corners of it, and told me that his lordship had mistaken, and that he desired me to accept that picture. While I was musing what to do, Mary said, Pray Madam take my poor advice, accept the picture and every thing he sends you ; for consider, that if you do not comply with every thing he has a mind for, you shall soon be put to death, and nobody can defend you ; but if you are obliging to him, he is a



very complaisant gentleman, and will be a charming lover, and you will be here like a queen. He will give you another apartment with fine gardens, and many young ladies shall come to visit you; so I advise you to send a civil answer, and desire a visit from him, or else you will soon repent it. O dear, cried I, must I abandon my honour without remedy? and if I oppose his desire, he will by force obtain it. So, full of confusion, I bid Mary give him what answer she pleased. She was very glad of my humble submission, and went to give Don Francisco an account of it. In a few minutes she returned, with great joy, to tell me that his lordship would honour me with his company to supper. In the meantime he desired me to mind nothing but how to divert myself, and to give Mary my measure for some new clothes, and order her to bring me every thing I wished for. Mary added,—Madam, I may now call you my mistress, and must now tell you, that I have been in this holy office these fourteen years, and know the customs of it well; but as silence is imposed on me under pain of death, I cannot tell you any thing but what concerns your person: so, in the first place, do not oppose the holy father's will: secondly, if you see some young ladies here, never ask them any questions, neither will they ask you; and take care that you never tell them any thing. You may come and divert yourself among them at such hours as are appointed. You shall have music, and all sorts of recreations. Three days hence you shall dine with them; they are all ladies of quality, young and merry. You will live so happily here, that you will not wish to go abroad; and when your time is expired, the holy fathers will send you out of this country, and marry you to some nobleman. Never mention your name, nor Don Francisco's to any. If you see here some young ladies you have formerly been acquainted with, no notice must be taken; and nothing must be talked of but indifferent matters. All this made me astonished, or rather stupified, and the whole seemed to me a piece of enchantment. With this lesson she left me, saying she was going to order my dinner; every time she went out, she locked the door. There were but two windows in my room, and they were so high that I could see nothing through them; but hunting about, I found a closet, with all sorts of historical and profane books; so I spent my time till dinner in reading, which was some satisfaction to me.

“In about two hours she brought dinner, at which was every thing that could satisfy the most nice appetite. When dinner was over, she left me alone, and told me if I wanted any thing, to ring the bell: so I went to the closet again, and spent three hours in reading. I think I was really under some enchantment; for I was in a perfect suspension of thought, so as to remember

neither father nor mother. Mary came and told me that Don Francisco was come home, and that she thought he would come and see me very soon, and begged me to receive him with all manner of kindness.

“At seven in the evening Don Francisco came, in his night-gown and cap; not with the gravity of an inquisitor, but with the gaiety of an officer. He saluted me with great respect, and told me that his coming to see me, was only to show the value he had for my family, and to tell me that some of my lovers had procured my ruin, having accused me in matters of religion; that the informations were taken, and the sentence pronounced against me, to be burnt alive in a dry-pan, with a slow fire; but that he out of pity and love to my family, had stopped the execution of it. Every word was a mortal stroke to my heart. I threw myself at his feet, and said, Ah! Seignior, have you stopped the execution for ever? It only belongs to you to stop it, or not, said he, and with this he bade me good night. As soon as he went away, I fell a crying, but Mary came and asked what made me cry so bitterly? Ah! good Mary, said I, tell me what is the meaning of the dry-pan and gradual fire? for I expect to die by it. O Madam, said she, never fear. You shall see ere long the dry-pan and the gradual fire; but they are made for those that oppose the holy father’s will; not for you that are so obliging as to obey it. But pray, was Don Francisco very obliging? I do not know, said I, for his discourse has put me out of my wits; he saluted me with great civility, but he left me abruptly. Well, said Mary, you do not yet know his temper; he is extremely kind to people that are obedient to him, but if they are not, he is as unmerciful as Nero; so for your own sake, take care to oblige him in all respects. She bade me be easy and go to supper; but the thoughts of the dry-pan so troubled me, that I could neither eat nor sleep that night.

Early in the morning Mary got up, and told me, that nobody was yet stirring in the house, and that if I would promise secrecy, she would show me the dry-pan and the gradual fire; so taking me down stairs, she brought me into a large room with a thick iron door, and within it was an oven burning, and a large brass pan upon it, with a cover of the same and a lock to it. In the next room, there was a great wheel covered on both sides with thick boards; and opening a little window in the centre of it, she desired me to look with a candle on the inside of it. There I saw that all the circumference of the wheel was set with sharp razors. After that she showed me a pit full of serpents and toads. Now, my good mistress, said she, I’ll tell you the use of these three things. The dry-pan is for heretics, and those who oppose the holy father’s will and pleasure. They are put

naked alive into the pan, and the cover of it being locked up, the executioner begins to put a small fire in the oven, and by degrees he increases it till the body is reduced to ashes. The second is designed for those that speak against the Pope, and the holy fathers; for they are put within the wheel; and the little door being locked, the executioner turns the wheel till the person is dead. And the third is for those who condemn the images, and refuse to give due respect and veneration to ecclesiastical persons; for they are thrown into the pit, and become the food of serpents and toads. Then Mary said to me, that another day, she would show me the torments for public sinners: but I was in so great an agony at what I had seen, that I desired her to show me no more places; so we went to my room, and she again charged me to be very obedient to all the commands of Don Francisco, for I might be assured if I was not, that I must undergo the torments of the dry-pan. I conceived such a horror of the gradual fire, that I was not mistress of my senses; so I promised Mary to follow her advice. If you are in that disposition, said she, leave off all fear, and expect nothing but pleasure and satisfaction.—”

Hitherto I have given the narrative nearly in the author's words, with very little abridgment; but I forbear giving the particulars of what immediately follows. Seduction, in its most refined form, is a process which ought not to meet the public eye. The holy fathers of the Inquisition knew perfectly how to work upon the imagination of their wretched victims, first by putting lascivious books in their way, and then upon their fears, by showing them the instruments of torture, so as effectually to bend the most unyielding to their will. The sequel of the story shall be given in my next Number. There can be no doubt with regard to the truth of the narrative. The author was known, after his conversion from Popery, to some of the nobility and dignitaries of the Church of England; and he has his character certified at the beginning of his first volume, under the hand of the bishop of London. He wrote what he saw and heard from eye and ear witnesses; and the reverend J. Baker, who must have been his cotemporary, in his History of the Inquisition, gives this entire story, with a declaration of his conviction of its truth.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXVIII.

~~~~~  
*SATURDAY, DECEMBER 23d, 1820.*  
~~~~~

PROCEED we now to the sequel of the story of the young lady in the Inquisition, whose case occupied the greater part of my last Number.—“About ten o’clock, Mary came, says she, and dressed me. We left Don Francisco in bed, and she carried me into another chamber, very delightful, and better furnished than the first; for the windows were lower, and I had the pleasure of seeing the river and gardens. Mary then told me, that the young ladies would come and pay me their respects before dinner; and would take me to dine with them; and begged me to remember her advice; she had scarcely finished, when I saw a troop of young beautiful ladies, finely dressed, who came, one after another, to embrace me, and to wish me joy. My surprise was so great, that I was unable to answer their compliments; but one of them seeing me silent, said, Madam, the solitude of this place will affect you in the beginning, but when you begin to feel the pleasures we enjoy, you will quit your pensive thoughts. Now we beg of you the honour to come and dine with us to-day; and henceforth three days in a week. I returned them thanks; so we went to dinner. That day we had all sorts of exquisite meats, delicate fruits, and sweetmeats. The room was long, with two tables on each side, and another at the front of it; and I reckoned in it that day fifty-two young ladies, the eldest not exceeding twenty-four years. After dinner we went up to a long gallery, where some of us played on instruments of music, others at cards; and some walked about for three or four hours together. At last Mary came up ringing a small bell, which was, as I was told, the signal to go to our own rooms; but Mary said to the whole company, ‘Ladies, to-day is a day of recreation, so you may go into what rooms you please till eight o’clock.’ They all desired to go into my apartment with me. We found in my antichamber a table, with all sorts of sweetmeats upon it;—iced cinnamon, almond milk, and the like.

Every one ate and drank, but nobody spake a word about the sumptuousness of the table, or the Inquisition, or the holy fathers.

“ They retired to their respective apartments at eight o’clock, when Mary came to conduct me to Don Francisco, with whom I was to sup and spend the night. In the morning, when I returned to my own chamber, I found ready two suits of clothes of rich brocade, and every thing else suitable to a lady of the first rank. I put on one, and when I was quite dressed, the ladies came to wish me joy, all dressed in different clothes, much richer than before. We spent the second and the third day in the same sort of recreation ; Don Francisco continuing in the same manner with me : but on the fourth morning, after drinking chocolate, (which it was the custom to do in bed,) Mary told me, that a lady was waiting for me in her own room, and with an air of authority desired me to get up. Don Francisco saying nothing to the contrary, I obeyed, and left him in bed. I thought this was to give me some new comfort, but I was very much mistaken ; for Mary conveyed me into a lady’s room not eight feet long, which was a perfect prison ; and told me this was my room, and this young lady my bedfellow and companion ; and without saying any more she left me there.

“ What is this, dear lady ? said I ; is it an enchanted place, or hell upon earth ? I have lost father and mother, and what is worse, I have lost my honour, and my soul for ever. My new companion, seeing my agitation, took me by the hands, and said, Dear sister, forbear to cry and grieve ; for such extravagant behaviour will only draw upon you a cruel death. Your misfortunes and ours are exactly of a piece. You suffer nothing that we have not suffered before you ; but we dare not show our grief for fear of greater evils. She advised me to be sure and show no uneasiness before Mary, who was the only instrument of their torments or comfort. I was in a most desperate condition ; but my new sister Leonora prevailed so much upon me, that I overcame my vexation before Mary came to bring our dinner, which was very different from what we had had for three days before. After dinner another maid came to take away the plate and knife, for we had but one for us both ; and after she had gone out and locked the door, Leonora told me that we should not be disturbed again till eight o’clock ; and that if I would promise to keep secret what she should tell me, while I remained in that house, she would reveal all that she knew. I promised all that she desired, upon which she began as follows :—

‘ My dear sister, you think your case very hard ; but I assure you all the ladies in this house have already gone through the same. In time you will know all their stories, as they hope to know yours. I suppose Mary has been the chief instrument of your fright, as she has been of ours ; and I warrant she has shown you some horrible places, though not all ; and at the mere thought of them, you were so much troubled in your mind, that you have chosen the

same way we did to redeem yourself from death. By what has happened to us, we know that Don Francisco has been your Nero; for the three colours of our clothes are the distinguishing tokens of the three holy fathers; the red silk belongs to Don Francisco, the blue to Guerrero, and the green to Aliaga. We are strictly commanded to make all demonstrations of joy, and to be very merry for three days when a lady comes first here, as we did with you, and you must do with others; but afterwards we live like prisoners, without seeing a living soul, but the six maids, and Mary, who is the housekeeper. We dine all of us in the hall three days in the week. When any one of the holy fathers has a mind for any one of his slaves, Mary comes at nine o'clock, and conducts her to his apartment. Some nights Mary leaves the door of our rooms open, and that is a sign that one of the fathers has a mind to visit us that night; but we do not know whether it is our patron or not. If one of us happens to be with child, she is removed to a better chamber, and she sees nobody but the maid till she is delivered. The child is taken away, and we know not where it is carried. I have been in this house six years, and was not fourteen when the officers took me from my father's house. I have had one child here. We have at present fifty-two young ladies; and we loose every year six or eight; but where they are sent we do not know. We always get new in their places; and I have seen here seventy-three ladies at once. Our continual torment is to think that when the holy fathers are tired of us they will put us to death; for they never will run the hazard of being discovered in their villany: So, though we cannot oppose their commands, yet we continually pray to God to pardon those ills which we are forced to commit, and to deliver us out of their hands; so, my dear sister, arm yourself with patience, for there is no other remedy.'

By this discourse of Leonora, the young captive was prevailed upon to make the best of her condition. She found every thing to be as she was told. She continued in durance eighteen months, in which time the company lost eleven ladies, and got nineteen new ones. "When the French soldiers threw open the doors of their prison, M. Faulcant, says she, happily for me, opened the door of my room, and from the moment he saw me, showed me great civility. He took Leonora and me to his own lodgings, and, after hearing our stories, for fear things should turn to our disadvantage, he dressed us in men's clothes, and sent us to his father's. So we came to this house, where I was kept for two years as the old man's daughter; till M. Faulcant's regiment being broke, he came home, and two months after married me. Leonora was married to another officer, and went to live in Orleans."

From the above it appears, that about once a month, upon an average, a family in Zaragossa was robbed of a daughter to recruit the seraglio of the holy fathers of the inquisition. This narrative does not refer to the dark ages of Popery; the thing took place



but about a hundred years ago ; and who can tell the misery that was thus inflicted upon many a family ? In fact, there could be no such thing as domestic comfort in any country in which the Inquisition was established. It was not enough that every young lady kept at home ; that she did not so much as show her face at a window ; this would certainly have made her a victim to any member of the holy office whose spies might be passing. Every exposure of the kind therefore was most carefully avoided ; but this did not serve the purpose of concealing such as might be desirable inmates of the Inquisition. Every lady was required to make confession to a priest twice, or at least once, a year ; the priests were all dependants of the holy office ; they were in short the panders of lewdness to the lords Inquisitors ; and becoming, by means of confession, acquainted with the name and circumstances of every individual in every family, it was easy for them to inform their superiors where they might obtain a victim, to be sacrificed at the shrine of their lusts.

It is difficult to exhibit any thing more wicked than what I have related, with regard to the Inquisition, in this and my last Number ; but there is something more tragical in what follows ; in which we shall find that all the horrors of the “dry-pan,” or burning to death, were actually realized in the case of young accomplished ladies, for no crime but that of heresy, or believing as they were taught by the word of God. I quote from an article formerly referred to, in the Literary and Statistical Magazine for June last ; as continued from the Number for March :—

“ Among the twenty-one victims who were burned at Valladolid, in the Auto-da-fe of 1559, the case of Dona Maria de Bohorques is peculiarly interesting. Dona Maria was a natural daughter of Pedro Garcia de Xeres Bohorques, and had just completed her twenty-first year, when she was arrested on suspicion of Lutheranism. Under the instruction of D. Juan Gil, Bishop elect of Tortosa, she was perfectly acquainted with the Latin language, and had made considerable progress in Greek. She knew the gospels by heart, and was deeply read in those commentaries, which explain in a Lutheran sense, the texts referring to justification by faith, good works, the sacraments, and the characteristics of the true church.

“ Dona Maria was confined in the secret prison of the Inquisition, where she avowed the doctrines imputed to her, defended them against the arguments of the priests who visited her, and boldly told the Inquisitors, that instead of punishing her for the creed which she held, they would do much better to imitate her example. With regard to the depositions of her accusers, though she allowed the principal points, she persisted in denying some facts which related to the opinions of other individuals ; and this denial gave the Inquisitors an opportunity of putting her to the rack. By this torture they only procured a confession, that her sister Johanna Bohorques knew her sentiments and had not disapproved them :

and as she persisted in her profession of faith, sentence was passed upon her as an obstinate heretic. In the interval between her condemnation and the Auto-da-fe, in which she was to suffer, the Inquisitors made every exertion to bring her back to the Romish faith. They sent to her successively two Jesuit and two Dominican priests, who laboured with great zeal for her conversion, but returned without having effected their object, full of admiration of the talents she displayed, and regretting the obstinacy with which she persisted in what they supposed a damnable heresy. The evening before the Auto-da-fe, two Dominicans joined in the attempt, and were followed by several theologians of other orders. Dona Maria received them with civility, but dissuaded them from attempting a hopeless task. To the professions which they made of being interested in the welfare of her soul, she answered that she believed them to be sincere, but that they must not suppose that she, being the party chiefly concerned, felt a less interest in the matter than they did. She told them that she came to prison fully satisfied of the orthodoxy of the creed which she held, and that she had been confirmed in her belief by the evident futility of the arguments brought against it.

“At the stake, Don Juan Ponce de Leon, who had just abjured the Lutheran doctrines, exhorted Dona Maria to follow his example. The weakness of this apostate for a moment overcame her, and she silenced him by language rather of contempt than of pity. Recollecting herself, however, she told him that the time for controversy was past, and that their wisest plan would be, to occupy the few minutes which remained to them, in meditating on the death of their Redeemer, in order to confirm that faith by which alone they could be justified. We have already mentioned, that if a condemned heretic renounced his heresy even at the stake, he was not burned alive, but first strangled and then burned; (and this was all that poor Juan Ponce de Leon gained by his apostacy.) On this occasion the attendant priests, moved by the youth and talents of Dona Maria, offered her this milder death if she would merely repeat the creed. With this offer she readily complied, but having finished it, she immediately began to explain its articles according to the sense of the reformers. This confession of faith was immediately interrupted; Dona Maria was strangled by the executioner, and her body was afterwards consumed to ashes.

“We have mentioned that the only confession extorted by the rack from Maria Bohorques was, that her sister knew her religious sentiments, and had not disapproved them. This sister was named Johanna; she was a legitimate daughter of the same Pedro Garcia, and was married to Don Francis de Vargas, lord of Heguera. She was immediately arrested upon the confession of her sister Maria, and though six months advanced in pregnancy, she was confined in one of the common dungeons of the inquisition. In this dungeon

she was delivered of a child, and received no assistance except from a young woman, confined on a charge of Lutheranism, who occupied the same cell. Eight days after its birth the child was taken from her; and soon after, her friendly nurse, having been tortured, returned to the dungeon with bruised and dislocated limbs; and Dona Johanna, still feeble from her confinement, was called upon to repay the charitable attentions she had received. Before her health was established, she also was subjected to the torture. Her enfeebled frame sunk under its sufferings: a blood vessel burst while she was on the rack, and in two days she was delivered by death from any further persecution. After perpetrating this foul murder, the Inquisitors thought it sufficient expiation to declare Dona Johanna innocent at the ensuing Auto-da-fe."

Cases of the same kind might be multiplied to any extent; but my design is, to give only a selection by way of sample. The following affords a view of the secrecy with which the affairs of the holy office were conducted: "When the Familiar is sent for to apprehend any person, he has the following order put into his hand. 'By the command of the reverend father N an Inquisitor of heretical pravity, let B. be apprehended and committed to the prisons of this holy office, and not be released out of them, but by the express order of the said reverend Inquisitor.' And if several persons are to be taken up at the same time, the Familiars are commanded so to order things, that they may know nothing of one another's being apprehended. And at this the Familiars are so expert, that a father and his three sons, and three daughters, who lived together in the same house, were all carried prisoners to the inquisition, without knowing any thing of one another's being there until seven years afterwards, when they that were alive came forth to an Auto-da-fe."—*Limborch, Vol. i. p. 187.*

Thus persons the most nearly related to one another, may be confined in contiguous cells without knowing it; and the merciless turnkeys of the holy office are constantly on the watch, to prevent the utterance of any sound, lest it should occasion the discovery of some secret. If a person bemoans himself, or bewails his misfortune, or prays to God with an audible voice, or sings a psalm or sacred hymn, he is instantly silenced. Persons may know one another by their cough, as well as by their articulate voice, and therefore, no man was allowed even this expression of his misery in the damp dungeons of the Inquisition. Limborch relates the following instance, which, he says, he had from several persons. "A prisoner in the Inquisition coughed. The jailors came to him, and admonished him to forbear coughing, because it was unlawful to make any noise in that house. He answered it was not in his power to forbear. However, they admonished him a second time to forbear it, and because he did not, they stripped him naked and cruelly beat him. This increased his cough, for



which they beat him so often, that at last he died through the pain and anguish of his stripes."

I shall bring in here what was intended for the conclusion of No. CXXV. but for which I had not room. These cruelties were not, indeed, committed within the walls of the Inquisition, but they were done with the concurrence of the head of the church, and the head Inquisitor at Rome.

Sir Samuel Moreland has given a great number of instances of cruelty to individuals whom he names, with the attestations of witnesses, which he procured upon the spot. With a few of these I shall conclude the present Number. I have been accused of being too delicate in some instances, especially in my treatment of the subject of clerical celibacy. I have now with some reluctance brought myself to speak plainly out, some facts and circumstances, which I hope will have the effect which I have all along avowed to be the object of my work, not to injure the persons of Papists, but to hold up the system of Popery, which I maintain to be the invention of the devil, to universal detestation. I advise all who have the misfortune to have weak nerves, to read no more of this Number.

Upon the 22d of April, 1655, in a certain place called La Sarcena, one Captain Pola of Pancalier, took two poor women of La Torre, and with a falchion ripped up their bellies, and left them wallowing upon the snow in this lamentable condition. And this was seen by M. Gross, minister of Villaro.

Martha Constantin, wife of Jacob Barral, after she had seen several others most cruelly put to death, was herself first ravished, and then had her breasts cut off. The soldiers took and fried them and presented them to their comrades as tripe.

Anna, daughter of Giovanni Charboniere, had a long stake thrust through her body longitudinally, by some soldiers, who carried her thus upon their shoulders, quite naked, until they were tired; and then they stuck the end of the stake in the ground, and thus left her dead body exposed to the world.

Giovanni Tolasano, a mercer of Villaro, as he was passing by the hill of Juliano, saw a poor woman flying from the soldiers, with a cradle upon her head, wherein was a young sucking child; but seeing she was like to be overtaken by them, she left her cradle in the middle of the way, as verily believing those butchers could not possibly have such hearts of adamant as to lay violent hands upon the poor innocent babe, and so hid herself not far from the place, in the cleft of a rock. But those blood-hounds having found the infant in the cradle, in the most savage manner took it out, and pulled it into four pieces or quarters; and afterwards finding the mother, ravished her, then cut off her head, and left her dead body upon the snow.

The daughter of Moyses Long, of Bobio, about ten years of age, was taken by the soldiers of Piedmont, as she was flying

upon the snow, who, broaching her upon a pike or halbert, roasted her alive upon a broad stone not far from the place. When they had thus done, they cut off a slice of her flesh, intending to have made a meal's meat on her, but not finding it thoroughly roasted, their stomachs would not serve them to eat it.

M. Gross, pastor of Villario, in Bobio, told the author (Sir S. M.) during his abode at Geneva, that being at Pignerolio, he heard several persons affirm, that some of the murderers, having taken eleven men at Garcigliana, heated a great oven or furnace red hot, and caused those poor creatures to throw one another into the said burning fiery furnace; and when it came to the last man, they themselves threw him in. It is a thing most certain also, that very frequently these blood-hounds pursued and hunted out multitudes of those poor Protestants among the rocks and mountains, by the very traces of their bleeding feet and legs, which had been sorely cut and mangled by the ice and flints which they met with by the way, in their flight.

These are a few examples, taken almost at random from a catalogue of some hundreds, related with horrible minuteness by the English Ambassador. It would be difficult to find instances of such cruelty among the rudest savages; for there is no ferocity or cruelty equal to that with which the devil qualifies his agents for the propagation of idolatry and superstition, and for blotting out the knowledge of real Christianity from the earth.

This remark is confirmed by what Dr. Geddes records of what came under his own observation, when he was an eyewitness of an Auto-da-fe. The victims were chained to stakes, at the height of about four feet from the ground. A quantity of furze that lay round the bottom of the stakes was set on fire; by a current of wind it was in some cases prevented from reaching above the lowest extremities of the body. Some were thus kept in torture for an hour or two, and were actually roasted, not burnt to death. This spectacle, says he, is beheld by people of both sexes, and all ages, with such transports of joy and satisfaction, as are not on any other occasion to be met with. And that the reader may not think that this inhuman joy is the effect of a natural cruelty that is in these people's disposition, and not the spirit of their religion, he may rest assured, that all public malefactors, except heretics, have their violent death no where more tenderly lamented, than amongst the same people, and even when there is nothing in the manner of their death that appears inhuman or cruel.—*See Limborch, Vol. ii. p. 301.*

THE

# Protestant,

No. CXXIX.

---

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30th, 1820.

---

ACCORDING to the courtly, or over-courteous morality of this world, it is alleged, that the more deficient a man is known to be, with respect to any particular virtue, the more abundantly it ought to be bestowed upon him, by his flatterers during his life, and his panegyrists after his death. The Inquisition seems to have acted upon this principle from its very commencement. It gave itself out as the *holy* office, and all men were required to regard it, and call it holy, though it is well known to have been the most unholy tribunal that ever afflicted the world. In like manner the Inquisition incessantly boasted of its justice and its mercy, especially of the latter, though it is certain that its justice was a perversion of all righteousness, and the tenderest of its mercies was the most barbarous cruelty.

I had thought of afflicting my readers by presenting them with a particular account of an Auto-da-fè, which would have occupied a Number or two, but on reflection, I rather chose to pass this over. Those who wish to have their souls harrowed up by such an exhibition, may find materials in Limborch's History, and in almost all the Martyrologies in the English language. Suffice it to say, that an Auto-da-fè, or Act of Faith, was the burning to death of such persons as the holy Inquisition was pleased to pronounce defective in their belief of all, or any of the error and nonsense which the Church of Rome had propounded as articles of faith. This burning took place as often as the holy office could provide subjects for the fire. Kings and queens were not only invited to witness it as a most joyful spectacle; but actually required to sanction it with their presence, under the pain of being themselves suspected of heretical pravity. Limborch gives a series of prints, in which the king and queen of Spain are represented under a rich and royal canopy, feasting their eyes with the delightful



spectacle of a number of poor wretches led to be committed to the flames ; and the representation is by no means a production of the fancy. It is sober historical truth, the memory of which will remain to the latest ages, as an evidence of the diabolical cruelty and wickedness of the Church of Rome, and of all those who lent themselves to its support.

It was the manner of the holy Inquisitors to be continually boasting of their mercy. It often happened that the most inoffensive man in a city was brought before them, under a vague suspicion of something which related to the integrity of the faith. After having his spirits broken by confinement in a dungeon for months or years, he was required to make confession of his crimes, while he was not conscious of any thing in his conduct that deserved the name of crime. The holy fathers would not condescend to tell him what it was of which he was accused ; but they would assure him that the holy Inquisition was merciful, and that if he would make a free and candid confession, he should be mercifully dealt with. The poor man could not confess crimes of which he was not guilty ; and the holy Inquisitors, in their great mercy, would send him back to his dungeon, with a command to review his whole life ; and there they would leave him for a year or two longer, to recollect, if he could, every word that he had spoken, and every person to whom he had spoken, during the whole period of his conscious existence.

A man thus shut up in a dark and loathsome dungeon, without the society of a living creature, would very probably recollect some foolish thing that he had said to some person in the course of his life ; and trusting in the boasted mercy of the holy tribunal, he would confess this the next time he was called to a hearing. This however would only furnish his tormentors with a pretext for teasing him with more ensnaring questions, not only with regard to himself, but also the persons with whom he had conversed upon any point of religion. These persons would be immured within the sacred walls before the next morning ; and he himself would be sent back to his dungeon to consider of what other crimes he ought to accuse himself.

These reflections are not thrown out at random. They are supported by incontestible facts, as any person may see who will read the numerous relations in Limborch, and in Baker's History of the Inquisition. This last author, among a number of instances, relates at great length, the sufferings of one Isaac Martin, an English merchant in Malaga, who was confined in the Inquisition in 1714, and grievously tormented, upon suspicion of his being a Jew, and that upon no stronger evidence than that his name was Isaac, and that he had a son whom he had named Abraham. It was in vain that he protested that he was a Christian of the Church of England, and that Abraham and Isaac were not Jews, but had lived hun-

dreds of years before the designation of *Jew* was known in the world. The Inquisitors would not believe his assertion either with regard to himself or the patriarchs. He was known to be guilty of the crime of being rich, of which he was effectually purged by the holy office, for this heresy yields to force sooner than any other; and then he was sent out of the country with a body dreadfully torn by scourging and other torments which he had endured.

But the unparalleled hypocrisy and impudence of the Inquisitors appear chiefly in their professions of mercy for those whom they have devoted to the flames. It is pretended that the holy office puts no man to death. It merely, on finding persons obstinate heretics, delivers them over to the civil power, which in a Popish country, must submit to be the church's hangman; and when men are so delivered over, it is with great affectation of pity and compassion on the part of the ghostly fathers, who beseech the magistrate, perhaps with tears in their eyes, as a crocodile is said to shed tears over the prey he is about to devour, to deal mercifully with the unhappy criminals, and to be sure not to hurt them; and this at the very time when the stake is fixed, the fuel prepared, and people assembled to witness their execution; and if any magistrate should so understand them as to comply with their request, the fire would soon be applied to himself as a favourer of heretics.

"Is there," says Dr. Geddes, in his view of the Court of Inquisition in Portugal, p. 446. "in all history, an instance of so gross and confident a mockery of God, and the world, as this of the Inquisitors beseeching the civil magistrate, not to put the heretics they have condemned and delivered to them, to death? For were they in earnest when they made this solemn petition to the secular magistrates, why do they bring their prisoners out of the Inquisition, and deliver them to those magistrates in coats painted over with flames? Why do they teach that heretics, above all other malefactors, ought to be punished with death? And why do they never resent the secular magistrates having so little regard to their earnest and joint petition as never to fail to burn all the heretics that are delivered to them by the Inquisition, within an hour or two after they have them in their hands? And why in Rome, where the supreme, civil, and ecclesiastical authority are lodged in the same person, is this petition of the Inquisition, which is made there as well in other places, never granted?"—Thus far Dr. Geddes. And let me here add, that this hypocrisy and dissimulation is the more vile and execrable, in that the Inquisitors are commanded by the bulls of several Popes, to compel the secular magistrate, under penalty of excommunication and other ecclesiastical censures, within six days, readily to execute the sentences pronounced by the Inquisitors against heretics, that is, to burn them. *Limborch, vol. ii. p. 289.*

On entering upon this subject, I said that Popish writers traced the Inquisition to a period as ancient as that of the Mosaic dispensation. I have since received from a correspondent, an extract from a Spanish author, who maintains that the holy tribunal had its origin in paradise ; but instead of ascribing it to its real author, who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning, this writer blasphemously represents the Creator himself as the first Inquisitor, and Adam and Eve as the first who were brought before the holy tribunal. The words are "Dizen que Dios fue Inquisidor de Adam y Eva por haver comido el vedado fruto." &c. &c. That is, "It is said that God was Inquisitor of Adam and Eve, for having eaten the forbidden fruit."

If there be any of my readers who wish to see more evidence of the bloody and murderous character of Popery than I have given in my late Numbers, I refer them to the narrative of the grand massacre in Paris, which is recorded in all our ecclesiastical histories and martyrologies. And here I take the opportunity of expressing my best thanks to a worthy correspondent in Ireland, for sending me an impression in wax, of a genuine medal which Pope Gregory XIII. ordered to be struck, in honourable commemoration of that, to him, joyful event. It is pretty generally known, that the Pope was so delighted with the intelligence which he received from Paris on that occasion, that he ordered solemn thanksgiving to God to be offered up in all the churches. But that the memory of the thing might not be forgotten, he ordered to be struck a medal in silver, which has on one side, a well-defined profile of himself, and on the reverse, the figure of an angel, with a crucifix in one hand, and a drawn sword in the other, in the act of destroying a confused multitude of human creatures, who are represented as falling down before him. O, what a delightful picture this must be to all good Papists ! and how they would rejoice if they had it in their power to do the thing over again ! Some sentimental Protestants will cry out against this as uncharitable, and they will insist upon it, that modern Papists are not so bloody-minded ; then let modern Papists themselves say so. Let them condemn the bloody massacre of thousands of peaceable citizens ; and let them condemn the fiend-like triumph and rejoicing of the head of their church on the occasion, and then they may perhaps deserve credit for their professions of being more humane and less bloody-minded than their fathers were. But I know they will not, and that they dare not pronounce any such condemnation. They will not say that the head of their church did wrong in rejoicing, and in calling the whole church to rejoice in that horrible massacre ; and, therefore, I do them no wrong in maintaining, that they would practise the same thing if they had it in their power.

The Papists in France had another glorious opportunity of glut-



ting themselves with the blood of Protestants, on the revocation of the edict of Nantz, by Lewis XIV. For particulars, I refer the reader to Jurieu's Pastoral Letters :—the Introduction to Quick's Synodicon :—and to a work in French, entitled, "*Etat des Reformes en France*:" printed at the Hague in 1685, during the very heat of the persecution. This work was lately sent me by a reverend gentleman from a remote part of the Highlands. It goes with much detail into the dreadful sufferings which Protestants were called to endure on that occasion. I do not know if there be an edition of it in English.

To come nearer home, I might fill a volume with a tragical account of the sufferings of Protestants in Ireland, in the great massacre and rebellion that commenced in 1641, in the reign of Charles I. "The rebellion," says Hume, "which had been upwards of fourteen years threatened in Ireland, and which had been repressed only by the vigour of the Earl of Stafford's government, broke out at this time with incredible fury. On this fatal day, the Irish, every where intermingled with the English, needed but a hint from their leaders and priests to begin hostilities against a people whom they hated on account of their religion, and envied for their riches and prosperity. The houses, cattle, and goods of the unwary English were first seized. Those who heard of the commotions in their neighbourhood, instead of deserting their habitations, and assembling together for mutual protection, remained at home, in hopes of defending their property, and fell thus separately into the hands of their enemies. After rapacity had fully exerted itself, cruelty, and that the most barbarous that ever in any nation was known or heard of, began its operations. A universal massacre commenced of the English (Protestants) now defenceless, and passively resigned to their inhuman foes; no age, no sex, no condition, was spared. The wife weeping for her butchered husband, and embracing her helpless children, was pierced with them, and perished by the same stroke; the old, the young, the vigorous, the infirm, underwent the like fate, and were confounded in one common ruin. In vain did flight save from the first assault; destruction was every where let loose, and met the hunted victims at every turn. In vain was recourse had to relations, to companions, to friends; all connexions were dissolved, and death was dealt by that hand from which protection was implored and expected. Without provocation, without opposition, the astonished English (Protestants), being in profound peace and full security, were massacred by their nearest neighbours with whom they had long upheld a continued intercourse of kindness and good offices. But death was the lightest punishment inflicted by those enraged rebels; all the tortures which wanton cruelty could devise, all the lingering pains of body, and anguish of mind,

the agonies of despair, could not satiate revenge excited without injury, and cruelty derived from no cause. To enter into particulars would shock the least delicate humanity; such enormities, though attested by undoubted evidence, would appear almost incredible.

“The weaker sex themselves, naturally tender and compassionate, here emulated their more robust companions in the practice of every cruelty. Even children, taught by the example, and encouraged by the exhortations of their parents, essayed their feeble blows on the dead carcasses, or defenceless children of the English (Protestants.) The very avarice of the Irish was not a sufficient restraint to their cruelty; such was their frenzy, that the cattle which they had seized, and by rapine made their own, yet because they bore the name of English, were wantonly slaughtered, or when covered with wounds, turned loose into the woods and deserts.

“The stately buildings or commodious habitations of the planters, as if upbraiding the sloth and ignorance of the natives, were consumed with fire, or laid level with the ground; and where the miserable owners shut up their houses and prepared for defence, perished in the flames, together with their wives and children, a double triumph was afforded to their insulting foes. If any where a number assembled together, and assuming courage from despair, were resolved to sweeten death by revenge upon their assassins, they were disarmed by capitulations and promises of safety, confirmed by the most solemn oaths; then the rebels, (in the immutable spirit of Popery,) with perfidy equal to their cruelty, made them share the fate of their unhappy countrymen. Others more ingenious still in their barbarity, tempted their prisoners with the fond hope of life, to embroe their hands in the blood of their friends, brothers, and parents; and having thus rendered them accomplices in guilt, gave them that death which they sought to shun by deserving it.

“Amidst all these enormities, the sacred name of religion sounded on every side, not to stop the hands of these murderers, but to enforce their blows, and to steel their hearts against every movement of human or social sympathy. The English, as heretics abhorred of God, and detestable to all holy men, were marked out by the priests for slaughter; and of all actions, to rid the world of these declared enemies to Catholic faith and piety, was represented as the most meritorious in its nature, which, in that rude people, sufficiently inclined to atrocious deeds, was further stimulated by precepts and national prejudices, empoisoned by those aversions, more deadly and incurable, which arose from an enraged superstition. While death finished the sufferings of each victim, the bigoted assassins, with joy and exultation, still echoed in his expiring ears, that these agonies were but the commencement of torments infinite and eternal.”

This extract from Hume's History is given by the Rev. Mr. Graham, as an Introduction to his interesting work,—*The Annals of Ireland*. "That he has not heightened the picture beyond reality," says this author, "the writings of Temple, of Clarendon, of Rushworth, of Whitlock, cotemporary historians, and volumes of original depositions taken on the occasion, and now extant in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, sufficiently prove."

Mr. Graham has, with immense labour, collected and arranged such a number of well attested facts on this subject, in his "*Annals of Ireland*," as will make the labour of the future historians very easy, and hold up to the abhorrence of future ages, the cruel and unrelenting spirit of the Romish religion. After the general massacre had commenced, and thousands were obliged to flee for their lives, Mr. Graham proceeds as follows, and gives Temple for his authority :—

"Many persons of good rank and quality came into Dublin, covered with old rags, and some without any other covering than a little twisted straw to hide their nakedness. Some reverend ministers escaped with their lives, sorely wounded—wives came bitterly lamenting the murder of their husbands—mothers lamenting their children barbarously destroyed before their faces. Some were so overwearied with long travel that they came creeping on their knees, others frozen up with cold, ready to give up the ghost in the streets. To add to their miseries, they found all manner of relief utterly disproportionable to their wants, the Popish inhabitants refusing to minister the least comfort to them, so that these sad creatures appeared like living ghosts in every street. Many empty houses in the city were, by special direction, taken for them; barns, stables, and outhouses were filled with them, yet many lay in the open streets, and there most miserably perished. Those of a better quality who could not bring themselves to beg, crept into private places, and some of them, who had not friends to relieve them, wasted away silently, and died unnoticed."

The infatuated and unfortunate King Charles I., who was most unhappily beset by a Popish queen; and a host of Jesuit priests, was pretty generally suspected of having given his countenance to this rebellion of his Popish, and consequent massacre of his Protestant subjects; and it is certain that the rebels gave out that they acted under a commission from him; but this is accounted for in the following manner, for which Mr. Graham refers to Borlase, p. 30, Nov. 4. 1641. "On this day Sir Phelim O'Neil, and Roger M'Guire, gave notice to their confederates, from the rebel camp at Newry, of their having received a commission from the king under the great seal of Scotland. This pretended commission was disclaimed by Lord M'Guire afterwards; and it appears that one Plunket, a worthy branch of the Cavan family of Popish



advocates, having taken an old broad seal from an obsolete patent out of Farnham Abbey, fixed it to his forged commission, to seduce the vulgar into an opinion of the loyalty of those who had excited them to take arms." It will be in the recollection of most of my readers, that a similar trick was practised, a few years ago, upon the Lord Mayor and citizens of London, by means of which, the public funds rose 20 per cent. in one hour. We need not then be surprised, that the Papists of Ireland, few, if any, of whom, in those days, could read, should have been deceived; and that the king should have got the blame of what arose from the unstimulated barbarity of his Popish subjects; or which, if stimulated at all, was by the queen and her Jesuit incendiaries.

It was then publicly declared by the rebels, *that no Protestant should be suffered to live in Ireland.* On Sunday, October 24, "Rory M'Guire, who had, on the preceding day hanged seventeen Protestants in the church of Clowes, seized Mr. Middleton, at Castlekeagh, alias Ballybalfure, in the county of Fermanagh, robbed him of his money, burned the county records in this gentleman's possession, and compelled him to declare himself a Papist, after which they hanged him and his wife and children, and put one hundred persons in the town to death." *P. 9. with reference to Borlase, p. 58, &c.*

Let us never forget that this wickedness was perpetrated under the influence of an unchanged and unchangeable religion, which is maintained in all its integrity by the Papists of the present day. My author introduces a remark of a late eminent civilian, which is well worthy of the attention of every man who is concerned for the safety of his country. "The government and legislature had better beware of attempting to conciliate the Roman Catholics of Ireland by reiterated concessions, for although they grant all the demands of the laity, *show me the man that can say, that their clergy have ever suffered a document to issue from their hands, by which the extent of their pretensions and expectations can be ascertained.*" The fact is, their expectations are nothing less than the overthrow of the present established order of things;—the establishment of their own religion, to the exclusion of every other;—and the restoration of all the property which belonged to the Popish establishment, and to Popish families, in former ages, and which had been forfeited by their treasons. This is what our Papists expect and desire; but it does not suit their purpose to make much talk about the extent of their expectations.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXX.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, JANUARY 6th, 1821.  
~~~~~

DECEIT and violence are the two main pillars of Satan's kingdom. This corresponds with the character of the adversary himself, who has been a *liar* and a *murderer* from the beginning; that is, one who makes use of deceit and violence for the promotion of his cause in the world. Viewed in this light, Popery proves itself to be of its father the devil. In my late Numbers, I have given, I think, sufficient evidence of its violent and murderous character. I shall now proceed to show how deceitful it is; and that it is no less dependent upon lying than upon murder for its support. I do not rest this assertion merely upon the falsehoods published by our Glasgow Papists against myself, which were exposed in my Letter to Mr. M<sup>c</sup>Hardy, which exposure remains to this day unrefuted. I shall prove my point by reference to a greater authority in the Romish church than any that Glasgow can boast of having possessed for at least two hundred and forty years.

It is a prominent feature in the character of Papists, that they will tell a man to his face what both he and they know to be a lie, and command him to believe it, under pain of death. In my last Number, I alluded in general terms to the revocation of the edict of Nantz, and the miseries which were, in consequence of this revocation, inflicted upon the Protestants in that kingdom, thousands of whom were compelled to leave their country for ever, or submit to the alternative of becoming Papists, or being put to death, or condemned to the galleys for life, which was the mildest sentence that any of them could expect. For almost a century, the Protestant religion had been legally recognized in that kingdom, and its professors protected, according to the edict above mentioned, for which they were indebted to the famous Henry IV. In these circumstances, there were many who professed to be Protestants merely because they had been so educated; but

who had no heartfelt conviction of the truth and importance of the tenets by which they were distinguished from their Popish neighbours. When the edict was revoked, and when all men were required, under pain of military execution, to conform to the church of Rome, and subscribe a declaration to that effect, which declaration was presented by a host of armed dragoons, there were not a few who refused to conform, choosing rather to suffer death, or the galleys, as it might please their tormentors, the merciful agents of the Pope, and Lewis XIV; but at the same time, it must be admitted, that great numbers of those who were Protestants only in name, terrified by what was threatened, and what they saw their neighbours suffer, did subscribe the declaration, did renounce the Protestant religion, and declare themselves good Papists, according to the will of the Pope and the King. Some real Christians, under the influence of fear, were induced to subscribe; but finding no peace in their consciences, they publicly recanted their cowardly compliance, and chose to suffer death rather than continue to deny the truth. These, however, were few in comparison of those over whom the fear of man prevailed, and who suffered themselves quietly to be considered as belonging to the merciful, holy, and infallible church of Rome.

On this occasion the celebrated Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, a man of rare talents, but a devoted partisan of the holy see, published what he called "The Pastoral Letter of my Lord the Bishop of Meaux to the new Catholics of his diocese." By the "new Catholics" are meant the recent converts, who had been compelled at the point of the bayonet to renounce the Protestant religion. "The pastoral Letter" congratulates them on their reconciliation with the only true church, in such language as this:—"I do not marvel, my dearest brethren, that you are returned *in troops, and with so much ease*, to the church where your ancestors have served God. The foundation of Christianity, and, as I have already said, the character of baptism, hath secretly called you hither." In the esteem of the bishop, who remained quietly at home, the conversion of these men was effected with much ease; but it appears, that in some instances at least, it was no easy task for the dragoons. "Set him matter of fact," says M. Jurieu, "against this pretended *facility* (of conversion) and assure him, that for four months time there have been assemblies almost every day in the Cevennes, and in the adjacent parts, for the offering up prayers and supplications to God, sometimes in woods, at other times in caves, and rocks, and dens of the earth. The dragoons, which almost always surprise them, put them to the sword, according to their instructions; they kill, and hang, and drag them to prisons; but all signifies nothing; they assemble nevertheless. In the month of June last, near the end thereof,



the dragoons having surprised an assembly near Nismes, they killed many of them on the place, and four they hung upon the trees. The hangmen withdrew, supposing that they would have no great inclination to return again to that place. But two hours after there was another assembly in the same place, on the dead bodies, and in the view of the carcasses that hung on the trees of the mountains. There is not a week passes without like assemblies and like massacres."

Now it was while the Protestants were suffering such cruel persecution, that the bishop of Meaux, in his Pastoral Letter, addressed his new Catholics,—those who had been compelled to become such, and that he had the impudence to tell them that they were voluntary converts,—that they had suffered nothing,—and that they had not even heard of such a thing as persons suffering on account of religion. His words are :—" Not one of you hath suffered violence, either in his person or goods. So far have you been from suffering torments, that you have not so much *as heard them mentioned*. I hear other bishops say the same. But for you, my brethren, I say nothing to you, but what you may speak as well as I. *You are returned peaceably to us, you KNOW IT.*" The design of the bishop was to make the world believe that there was no persecution in France at the time ; but that thousands of heretics were, of their own accord, and from a conviction of the truth, returning to the bosom of the Church ; and his appeal to the converts themselves was a Jesuitical trick, by which he hoped to stop the mouths of all gainsayers ; for it would be said that the new converts acquiesced in the truth of the statement ;—they had been appealed to as to the fact, and no one had denied it. But the bishop knew well that no one dared deny it, else he would have lost all the benefit of his conversion, and have been sent to the flames, or to the galleys for life. Thus were deceit and violence combined to prop up the tottering system of Antichrist. Violence is not so common now as it was then, for the world will not suffer it ; but the system of deceit is as prevalent as ever, of the truth of which I could produce abundant evidence. I long ago brought to view one fact which is conclusive on this subject. All the world knows that Popery is tolerated and protected in every part of the British empire, and that there is no legal obstruction to the free exercise of Popish worship any more than to that of other dissenters from the established religion, yet our Irish Papists lately told the head of their church, and published to the world, that they were suffering the most *sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people*. The impudence of the assertion was equal to that of the bishop of Meaux, who told a miserable and persecuted people, in the face of the world, that they had suffered no persecution ; and while the

bishop stood only upon his personal responsibility as an author, the Hibernian lie was asserted by a board, professing to represent the whole of "Catholic Ireland;" and it may therefore be considered as asserted by all the Papists in that kingdom, though not one of them should have suffered in a hair of his head, or to the extent of a farthing of his property on account of being a Papist.

My almost forgotten opponent Amicus Veritatis, in one of his letters in the Glasgow Chronicle, (see Prot. part I. p. 37.) has some piteous wailing about persecution; but he has taken care not to enter into particulars, lest the reader should discover that his Popish ancestors in this country had nothing to complain of, at least very little in comparison of what they inflicted upon Protestants in the times of their power. In support of something that I had written, I had quoted a bull of pope Urban VIII. To this Amicus Veritatis replied as follows:—"Respecting the bull of Pope Urban VIII., the style and language in which it is couched assure me that it must be a forgery. Its very date increases my suspicion. A period when the sword of persecution was unsheathed from its scabbard—when the flames of intolerance raged with destructive violence—when the storms of passion, like a hurricane upon the deep, overwhelmed the miserable victims of their fury—when the demon of falsehood spread her malignant influence over the hearts and sensibilities of men, and prompted them to invent the most wicked calumnies for the destruction of their Catholic brethren. Who would take a review, from the year 1577 to the year 1684, that would not shudder at the horrific scenes that were the consequence of accumulated forgeries?" &c.

I shall not stay long to inquire how my opponent comes to be so well acquainted with the "style and language" of the holy see, as to be assured that the bull here referred to is a forgery, and that merely from its style, and language, and date. It was produced in the Court of King's Bench, on the trial of one of the Irish rebels, February 10th, 1644, and so far as appears, no objection was made to it, either by the court, or the criminal. Its authenticity was not then questioned; and it is rather too late to question it now. This bull granted a plenary indulgence, and full remission of all their sins, to such Irish Papists as should most effectually contribute to the *extirpation* of their Protestant neighbours; and that the command of the holy father was obeyed to a fearful extent, and with the most barbarous cruelty, I again refer to the reverend Mr. Graham's Annals of Ireland, in which the fact is proved by the most abundant evidence.

During this period, to adopt the elegant language of my opponent, the sword of persecution was *unsheathed from its sheath*, or scabbard, as he has it. He was not thinking of the many thou-

sands who were murdered in Ireland, by their Popish neighbours, solely because they were Protestants. This subject had no magnitude in his eye. The murdered persons were heretics; and therefore, according to the true Romish doctrine, laid down by the Rhemish translators of the New Testament, putting them to death was no crime. (See their note on Rev. xvii. 6.) His declamation about "flames of intolerance," "storms of passion" overwhelming "the miserable victims of its fury," relates merely to the sufferings of a few Jesuits, who, in the reign of Elizabeth, and for some time after, were found plotting against the state, with a view to overturn the established order, and to restore Popery, and who, of course, suffered the penalty of their treason. As for his accusation that Protestants invented "the most wicked calumnies for the destruction of their Catholic brethren," I maintain, that the thing was impossible; for no such creatures were then known by Protestants as "Catholic brethren." Those who now assume the name would then have been called "Popish malignants;" and there was no occasion to invent calumnies against them:—they were the known and convicted enemies of our Protestant established government.

I am by no means disposed to deny that Protestants have been persecutors; but I do maintain that Papists have suffered little from this quarter, while Protestants themselves have suffered not a little from it. Severe laws were indeed enacted against Papists, but at different periods, from the Reformation to the Revolution in 1688, they were a mere dead letter. If a Papist chose to enjoy his religion in peace, he was much safer in England than a Puritan, and in Scotland than a Covenanter. I grant indeed, that during the period to which this remark chiefly refers, our government, though nominally Protestant, was much under Popish influence, as was less or more the case during the reigns of the three last of the Stuarts, when many conscientious Protestants suffered nearly as much as they had done under Popery; and those who were suffering very naturally desired, and loudly demanded the execution of the laws against Papists, who they believed were instigators of the persecution. The fact is, our Reformers brought their intolerant notions from Rome, and it was long ere their successors could shake themselves loose of principles which they had imbibed from their fathers. No consistent Protestant of the present day will justify Cranmer in putting poor women to death for being Anabaptists;—or the Presbyterians for attempting to compel all England to submit to their discipline;—or the Independents in New England for their severities against Quakers and witches. It would be easy to make out a bloody case against one or other of the three denominations, which might emulate, at an humble distance, some of the least horrible instances



of cruelty which I have given in my late Numbers. But it would be unjust, as well as ungenerous, to bring an accusation of this kind against the Independents, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians of the present day, because they disavow and condemn in the most unequivocal terms, not only persecution in general, but the specific acts of it, which stand on record against their predecessors, and the conduct of these predecessors themselves, by name, if they are able to ascertain the names of individuals who were guilty.

But the principles of Popery, and of course of all true Papists, are always the same. What the Pope commanded in the thirteenth century, when he issued an order to destroy and tread under foot, as venomous adders, hundreds of thousands of human beings, for disbelieving transubstantiation and purgatory, he has a right still to command ; and his subjects have no right but to obey. In a Protestant country like this, they will condemn and argue against persecution for conscience' sake, when it is considered merely as an abstract question ; but they will not condemn any specific act of persecution of which their holy church, or holy father, stands convicted ; and the reason is, they do not consider, at least they dare not call that persecution which the holy church pleases to do for the maintenance of the true faith. The doctrine of the church of Rome is very distinctly laid down by the bishop of Meaux, in a private letter to a gentleman of his diocese, who, it would appear, had some qualms of conscience about the severities which were inflicted upon the Protestants, and who had gone, or was about to go over to them notwithstanding their persecutions. The bishop disavows persecution on the part of the church ; but finds the state bound to do it at the church's bidding. It is worthy of remark, that this letter was written about the very time that he addressed his Pastoral Letter to the new converts, who were assured by him, that they had neither suffered nor heard of any persecution, or violence being inflicted upon persons on account of religion. I quote from Jurieu's Pastoral Letters, Let. I.

*" From MEAUX, April 3d, 1686.*

" MONSIEUR,

" I CONTINUE to write to you, notwithstanding the answer you made to my former letter. I have there observed a character and style too much of a minister, to attribute it to you. In a word, I apprehend that it does not proceed from a spirit such as yours. But although it be so, I shall not cease to invite you to return. I have seen in the letter you wrote to Mademoiselle of U. that the true church does not persecute. What understand you by that, Sir ? Do you understand that the church *by herself* never makes use of force ? That is very true, since the church has no other arms but spiritual. Do you understand

that princes, who are sons of the church, never ought to make use of the sword which God hath put into their hands to abase the enemies thereof? Do you dare to say contrary to the opinion of your own doctors, who have maintained by so many writings, that the republic of Geneva had power and right to condemn Servetus to the fire for denying the divinity of the Son of God? And without serving myself of the examples and authority of your doctors, tell me in what texts of Scripture heretics and schismatics are excepted from the number of those malefactors against which St. Paul says, God hath armed kings and princes. And although you will not permit Christian princes to take vengeance of such great crimes, because they are injurious to God, can they not take vengeance on them because they cause trouble and sedition in states? Do you not see clearly that they build upon a false principle?"—

Such is the doctrine of the great bishop of Meaux, who is allowed to be a pillar in the Romish temple. He is indeed of such authority among modern Papists, that his writings are usually referred to, as furnishing the best defence of the system that has appeared in modern times. Here, however, he appears as a mere sophist, and a sophist of the very lowest order. "Tell me," says he, "in what texts of Scripture heretics and schismatics are excepted from the number of those malefactors against which St. Paul says, God has armed kings and princes?" To this question another question would be a sufficient reply:—Tell me in what texts of Scripture heresy and schism are declared to be crimes cognizable by the civil magistrate? It is not in the power of the Pope himself to point out in the Bible any such text; and the bishop's challenge amounts simply to this;—supposing it were a crime for a man or a woman to have red hair,—tell me in what texts of Scripture persons having red hair are excepted from the number of those malefactors against which God has armed kings and governors? I do most unequivocally maintain that the colour of a man's hair is as much cognizable by the civil magistrate, as his private thoughts in relation to any religious principle in which he may conceive the salvation of his soul to be interested. If a man shall think erroneously on such an important subject, the matter rests between God and himself; and no human power has a right to interfere. There is nothing in the Apostle's words which can lead us to infer that civil governors have a right to interfere in our religious opinions, any more than in the colour of our hair. I must not be understood as asserting that heresy and schism are in themselves, and in the sight of God, as innocent as the colour of our hair; but I do maintain, that in the sight of the civil magistrate they ought to be held equally innocent; for they are not offences against the state, and therefore the magistrate, as head of

the state, has nothing to do with them. If false principles in religion shall lead any to be guilty of immoral acts, or to disturb the peace of society, such persons ought then to be taken up and punished by the magistrate, but not till then.

The bishop of Meaux seems very glad to avail himself of a Protestant authority for putting men to death for conscience' sake. He refers to the republic of Geneva, which claimed the power and right to condemn Servetus to death for denying the divinity of the Son of God. Such a power will not be conceded to the republic by Protestants of the present day; and the melancholy fact here referred to, proves nothing but that the Genevese, though they had renounced Popery in name, held fast too much of the thing, when they could, in cold blood, consign a man to be burnt to death for certain speculative opinions, however erroneous, or even blasphemous these opinions were. Our great Reformer, Calvin, has been much reviled of late years for the hand which he is said to have had in this business; and I am far from saying that Calvin understood the subject of liberty of conscience, for no man in his day understood it; and perhaps he did not use the means which he might have used for saving Servetus from the cruel death to which he was condemned; but what I would remark here is, that the bishop of Meaux, who certainly had no good will towards Calvin, and who would have been happy to publish any thing unfavourable to him, had it come in his way, does not so much as insinuate that he had any hand in the burning of Servetus; but gives it as the doing of the *republic of Geneva*, without so much as mentioning the name of the Reformer. The bishop lived much nearer the time of Calvin than we do, and according to a principle much insisted upon by Papists, had better opportunities of knowing the facts than we can have. Since, therefore, he did not consider Calvin implicated in the infamous transaction, the Anticalvinists of the present day have no right to declare him guilty.

I now, for the present, take leave of the subject of persecution and the Inquisition. I have got over the most disagreeable part of my labours; but I have still a great deal of work before me, which will occupy the greater part of the present year at least. In the next, and some following numbers, I shall pay my respects to some correspondents, beginning with an extract of a letter from Juvenis with remarks thereon.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXXI.

---

SATURDAY, JANUARY 13th, 1821.

---

A FEW weeks ago, I was favoured with a second letter from my correspondent Juvenis, equally well written, and in equally good temper with his former one. Had it been of moderate length, I should cheerfully have inserted it entire ; but I think his own good sense will suggest to him, that he cannot reasonably expect, that I should occupy so many of my pages with mere verbal criticism, as his dissertation on the Greek word *πετρος* alone would occupy ; not to mention his long extracts from the writings of ancient fathers, which have no weight with me, in reference to the point in question, and which would be of very little importance to my readers in general. Were I to print his whole letter, and reply to it all, it would take me the third time over the same ground, without having a new idea to suggest, or a new argument to combat.

Suffice it to say, that he has laboured with great ingenuity and acuteness to prove that *πετρος* signifies *rock* as well as *stone*. He has not convinced me that it is so ; but as I said before, (see Prot. No. CXIX. p. 119.) though I were to concede this to him, it would signify very little. He has not shown that it signifies *the* rock (*τη πετρα*) on which Christ promised to build his church ; and now I say, that were even this conceded to him, which it is not, he would be as far as ever from having shown, that Peter was bishop of Rome ; that the Popes are his successors ; that those lechers and murderers, who filled the see of Rome for hundreds of years, were Peter's successors, and Christ's vicars, and the foundation on which Christ built his church ; and yet, unless Juvenis can prove this, all his arguments go for nothing. It is the system of Popery as it appears in the world at present, and has done for a thousand years, with which I am contending ; and

unless Juvenis can make it appear from the New Testament, that such a system was appointed by Jesus Christ, it is of no use to dispute about the meaning of a word, or whether Christ constituted the apostle Peter his vicar, and head over his fellow-apostles. I defy the whole Church of Rome to prove even this; but suppose they had proved it, it would not follow, that the greatest monsters of cruelty and impurity, as most of the Popes have been, were Christ's vicars and heads of his church.

Juvenis disavows an inference which I drew from a clause in his former letter; namely, that by asserting the purity of the Church of Rome for the first 500 years, and limiting his remark to this period, he tacitly admitted its impurity thereafter. Justice requires me to insert his reply to this in his own words; and as he has some other things in the concluding part of his letter which are worthy of remark, I shall give it verbatim from this point:—

“ ‘But what,’ you say, ‘does my correspondent gain by asserting the purity of his church for 500 years? This is a tacit admission that she has been impure for more than double that time, seeing he has not a word to say in her behalf since the end of the fifth century.’ This admission I deny. I however admit the well known fact, that many Protestants assert the church’s corruption in the time to which you refer; and, to use the words of the Homilist, that ‘*the whole of Christendom had been at once drowned in abominable idolatry*, and that for the space of 800 years and *more*; but how far this was really the case, or how far it was consistent with the promises of Christ, does not fall to be examined in the subject I have in hand. In treating of the subject of the supremacy, I was aware that in consequence of this common opinion, the belief of those times would be of no authority: for this reason I kept myself to those ages immediately succeeding, and adduced the writers of those times as witnesses of the faith delivered by the apostles, which then continued to be taught. For giving so many proofs from these authors, I stated, that it was by reason of the clearness of the testimony of Protestant authorities, the words of some of whom I gave, as so explicitly admitting the purity of the church in those times. This, however, was only confining myself to the evidence of an authority acknowledged by the most learned Protestants, and by no means an admission that she was impure in any succeeding age. But you demand, what those Protestants meant by the church purity of those times? To me it seems to require no explanation; the words ‘pure’ and ‘purity’ are used in the most unlimited sense, and no comparison whatever with any future period; and to give it in still more unequivocal terms, adding that *they inviolably taught the faith delivered by the apostles*, words which require no comment. Those sagacious opponents would not have made such a concession, had they the least ground for saying the fact was otherwise.

“ ‘It has been,’ says a celebrated divine of the established church, ‘the common profession of Protestants to stand to the judgment of antiquity for the first 400 years and more, in all things; nay, we give the Romans the scope of the first 500 or 600 years.’—*Bishop Morton’s Appeal for Protestants*, p. 354. Yet to all the venerable writers of those times, which I cited as evidence of the faith of those ages, on the point in question, you declare that you are not obliged to submit to them, as you have never acknowledged their authority. You however add, that you will pay all due respect to the fathers in matters of fact, which came under their own observation, in so far as their account is consistent. This comes at once to the true nature of the question: I cited the fathers not as *judges* or expounders of the sense of Scripture, but as witnesses of the belief of the times in which they lived; those times which are declared to have taught the faith delivered by the apostles. Now as the sacred volume, in the point in question, as well as in many others, is liable to two interpretations, of a meaning directly opposite, what proof, I again ask, can we have which is the true one, but by referring to the belief of the Christian churches in those ages, which are allowed to have had the faith in the same purity as it was delivered? Therefore, as from the proofs I gave of the belief of the supremacy in those ages, it must be considered as the doctrine of apostles; and those testimonies are a farther confirmation of the plain course of our Saviour’s words without the aid of any forced interpretation. But you would wish to know what proof there is that these are the genuine writings of the fathers. What proof has the learned world, that the works ascribed to a Livy or a Xenophon are really the writings of these historians? The answer is generally known, and the cases are parallel. But then you assert that the Church of Rome found it convenient in ‘*the dark ages*,’ to make such erasures as were necessary to answer her own purposes. This you observe she could not so easily do with the New Testament, as the Greek church would be a check upon her. This subject, however, you promise to discuss at a future period. In the meantime, I may here ask a question, Had the Greek church none of the writings of the fathers? If she had, there was no doubt but she would preserve them from what you call the expurgatorian process of the *Index*, and be as much a check in the one case as in the other. As to the doctrines taught by the apostles, you deny that the fathers of the first ages had a better opportunity of knowing their true meaning than we ourselves have, seeing that they committed them to writing, which you observe we can understand as well as they could do. This might be true, if the inspired writings were so plain and simple as to be incapable of different interpretations; but as unhappily they are so subject to this abuse, it must be that the Christians of the first ages, living in times so near the apostles, and which con-



tinued to teach the faith pure, had better opportunities of knowing the true meaning, on doubtful points, than we have at this remote period, amidst so many contradictory explanations. On this point I will give you the opinion of one of the most eminent divines of the established church, of the present day. The *Sacramental Catechism*, a work in general estimation in the church of our own country, in page 6, after asking if the communion was to be of perpetual duration, and giving the words of 1 Cor. xi. 26. it adds, 'and because the Christians of the first ages, *who enjoyed the best means of information*, had this opinion of it.' The opinion that the earlier Christians enjoyed better opportunities for information on doubtful points, than we do, is by no means singular; but this specimen may be sufficient as coming from such a respectable source.

"You advise me to forsake the writings of saints and fathers, to pay attention to my Bible, and follow where I shall find it to lead. The advice to a certain extent is good. The Bible would doubtless be the only rule in matters of religion, if it were sufficiently plain on all points of Christian doctrine; but as unfortunately this is not the case, the inspired writer himself telling us, that there are many parts hard to be understood, which many wrest to their own destruction, and which we ourselves see made to answer the most opposite opinions. In these circumstances there surely can be no impropriety in referring to the writings of those who lived in purer times; not, however, as judges, but as witnesses of the faith of the Christian church, whilst it is declared to have taught the faith in the same purity as it had been delivered by the apostles.

"There are two or three points in my letter which have not been noticed. Perhaps they may not have been worthy of it, or perhaps it is a 'tacit admission' of their being correct. In it I observe the mistake of a word, p. 118, line 9, for *interpretations* read *interpolations*. I am sorry that this should have as little to boast of brevity as its predecessor: with all my endeavours I could not be more concise. I, however, trust you will excuse even a second intrusion on your patience. With your convenience, your remarks will truly oblige, yours, with respect,

JUVENIS."

29th Nov. 1820, (under the Edinburgh post mark.)

From the explanation with which my correspondent has favoured me, in the first paragraph of the preceding extract, I am satisfied that he did not mean to concede that his church became impure after the fifth century. He shows in a very intelligible manner, that he confined his remarks to the first 500 years, in condescension to certain Protestant writers, who had acknowledged the purity of the church of Rome during this period; not that he admitted the fact of her subsequent departure from purity of faith; and

therefore, I do most readily relieve him from the imputation which such an admission might be understood to imply. I understand him, therefore, to assert that, in his opinion, the church of Rome at this day, holds the faith delivered by the apostles, with as much purity as she did at the conclusion of the fifth century. I may, hereafter, show that she was not very pure even then ; but in the meantime, I wish to call the attention of my correspondent, and of my readers in general, to my admission that she was then *comparatively* pure. In my CXXth Number, page 122, speaking of the Church of Rome, I admitted, that "she was not then defiled by the absurdity of transubstantiation, and the idolatry of the mass ; nor was the worship of images then generally practised ; nor were the clergy then forbidden to marry ; nor was it then allowed to them to keep concubines ; and there are fifty other abominable things which were not then countenanced, but which sprung up in the dark ages which followed, and are now so essentially incorporated with the system that they cannot be separated from it." These words immediately precede, and stand in the same page with those which Juvenis quotes at the beginning of the first paragraph of his letter above cited. He must, therefore, have read them, and been perfectly familiar with them. Whence then is it that he makes no reply, and not even the most distant allusion to them in his long letter ? He finds that I had passed over some things in his former letter ; and from this he infers, that I had considered them unworthy of notice, or that my passing them over was "a tacit admission of their being correct." Now this is the fact. I did consider those two or three points in Juvenis' letter, of which I took no notice, either as correct, or not worth the correcting. Juvenis will, therefore, allow me to find that, his passing over the above two or three points about transubstantiation, and the mass, and images, and clerical impurity, is "a tacit admission" that my statement is true ; or else that the things are not worthy of notice. The latter he cannot do ; for some of the articles here enumerated are the main pillars of Popery. He is then reduced, upon his own principles, to the alternative of acquiescing in my assertion, that the idolatrous and abominable things above mentioned were not known in his church at the conclusion of the fifth century. But what then becomes of his leading doctrine, that the Church of Rome at this day holds the very same faith, and is at this day as pure as she was then ? If Juvenis thinks I do him any injustice, in inferring this acquiescence from his silence on the above points, I shall be glad to be informed by a writer so temperate as he is, what he really understands by transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass ; upon what authority he worships images ; and upon what principle of morality it is considered by his church better for a clergyman to live in secret impurity with a number of concubines, than openly in the state of honourable marriage.

Juvenis lays great stress upon the circumstance of certain Protestant writers having admitted the purity of the church of Rome during the first five centuries. This I consider of no value whatever. There are Protestants who maintain publicly, that the Church of Rome at the present day, is sound in the fundamental articles of religion, and who recommend a union between her and the Protestant church of England, though the fundamental doctrinal articles of the latter, are as much opposed to those of the former as human language can make them; and were indeed originally intended to exhibit a standard directly opposed to the doctrinal errors of Rome. This being the fact, it is not surprising that Protestants should be found who maintain the purity of the Church of Rome, at a period when she was a thousand times less polluted than she is now. But I must tell my correspondent, that on a point of this kind, I pay no more regard to the authority of modern Protestants than to that of ancient fathers; and therefore all that he builds upon their admissions must go for nothing.

It is very possible for a Church to have a sound creed; there may not be one article of her public profession inconsistent with the Holy Scriptures. Thus doctrinally she may appear pure in the sight of other churches; and yet she may be internally a mass of impurity. The Jewish church at different periods of her history, while holding the soundest creed in the world—professing to receive and hold fast the law of Moses, which was dictated by God himself, was yet no better than a body having no soundness in it, but full of wounds and bruises and putrifying sores. There is no heresy so bad as practical immorality; and whatever the creed of a church may be, if the prevailing spirit of its members be infidel or immoral, it is an impure church. That this was the case with the Church of Rome long before the conclusion of the fifth century, I appeal to every history that relates to ecclesiastical affairs during that period.

But that I may not be accused of resting upon mere human testimony, I shall shortly advert to what the New Testament informs us of, with regard to the Christians in Rome. I have already said that we do not find them any where in the inspired record, appearing as one organized body, under the title of the Church of Rome; but when Paul wrote his epistle to the Christians there, he had occasion to praise their faith, which no doubt was an acknowledgment of both its purity and steadfastness. But a sad change soon took place. The first fruits dropped one after another into the grave. The emperor Claudius had banished from the city all of them who were Jews by birth, Acts xviii. 2. Many were banished and suffered death in the reign of Nero; so that when Paul came to Rome, at least when he was first called to appear before the emperor, there does not appear to have been a faithful man among all the Christians in the city; at least not one whose faith was strong enough to



enable him to stand by the venerable and grievously persecuted apostle in the hour of trial. Like a parcel of cowards they all forsook him and fled. "At my first answer," says he, "no man stood with me, but all men forsook me; I pray God that this may not be laid to their charge." 2 Tim. iv. 16. This is the last apostolic account that we have of the Christians in Rome. It presents them in the light of cowards and apostates; for abandoning an apostle of Christ in such circumstances, was little, if any thing, short of abandoning Christ himself. Paul prayed for them that their great guilt might not be laid to their charge. It is hoped the prayer was heard in respect of many of them; but we have no evidence of the restoration of them as a body to that honourable character under which Paul first addressed them. Rom. i. 8. Who then will answer for their purity as a church during the four centuries which immediately followed?

We know upon the authority of the apostolic writings, that few of the primitive churches maintained purity of faith and practice even to the end of the apostolic age. The whole of the churches in Galatia became corrupted by the leaven of the Judaizing teachers, for which see Paul's epistle to them. The church in Corinth, besides abusing the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, tolerated very gross immorality in one of its members, for which see Paul's first epistle to that church, chapters v. and xi. Of the seven churches in the Lesser Asia, who were addressed by the head of the church, in epistles written to them by the apostle John, only two were found without blame; (Rev. ii, and iii.) all the rest were corrupted less or more, by the admission of erroneous principles, or the sufferance of immoral practices,—the latter being indeed the natural consequence of the former. Now I challenge the Church of Rome to show to the world upon what ground she claims the honour of not having erred, or rather the privilege of being incapable of error, for this is what she would have us believe she possesses. She cannot adduce a divine promise in her favour, which would not equally apply to the churches in Galatia, the church in Corinth, or the seven churches in Asia. When we convict the Church of Rome of gross errors in doctrine, and, if possible, of grosser immoralities in practice, instead of clearing herself of what is thus brought home to her, she shelters herself under Christ's promise to his spiritual body, that the gates of hell should never prevail against it; but the church of Rome has never been able to show, that this applied to her, any more than to the church in Corinth, or the churches in Galatia, and seeing we know the fact, that the gates of hell, or the influence of the devil, did prevail against them, we can see no reason, connected with this divine promise, why the same influence should not also have prevailed over the Church of Rome. It rests with Papists to produce the patent, under the broad seal of heaven, which invests their church with the privilege

of indefectability ; and until they can produce this, we must be allowed to believe that she is as liable to corruption, as any other church that is acknowledged to have become corrupt ; we must be allowed to give credit to the unequivocal testimony of history, that she became notoriously corrupt at no great distance of time from the period that other churches became so ; and we must also be allowed to believe the testimony of our own senses, when we read the blasphemous doctrines which are taught, and witness the idolatries which are practised by Papists of the present day, which inevitably lead us to the conclusion, that she is the most corrupt communion that ever appeared in the world under the much abused name of Christian. Juvenis merely hints *en passant*, a doubt whether it be consistent with the promises of Christ, to assert with the Homilist, that the whole of Christendom had been drowned in abominable idolatry, and that for the space of 800 years and more. But before he troubled himself with a doubt upon the subject, he ought first to have ascertained whether Christ had ever made any promise to what he calls, or what the Homilist calls, "Christendom?" There is certainly no such promise in the New Testament, nor any recognition of such a term as a designation of his kingdom ; nay, there is no recognition of the thing meant by it, and therefore none of Christ's promises can justly be made to apply to it.

I have no objection to the word "Christendom" when it is used merely to distinguish the countries in which Christianity is generally professed, from those in which Mahomedanism or heathenism prevails. But Christ's spiritual kingdom consists not of all who live in what are called Christian countries ; but only of such as are born again,—who are become new creatures through the divine influence of the gospel believed by them. These may be scattered through all the nations of "Christendom," and also among heathen nations. They cannot be all known to one another in this world ; but they are all known to him who is their Head. They may be a million of visible bodies on earth, if they were to be counted ; but they are all one body in Christ. These with the company already in heaven, are his church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. He will keep every one of them by his mighty power through faith unto salvation. Organized churches, such as those in Corinth, in Ephesus, in Philippi and elsewhere, were visible representations of Christ's spiritual body, or kingdom ; but he gave a special promise of perpetuity to none of them ; and it is certain that Rome cannot show that ever he made any such promise to her. She has, therefore, no right to argue from his promise to his spiritual body, that such a carnal body of corruption, as she is, shall never fall into error

*Farther remarks in my next.*



WM. MC GAVIN ESQ.

FROM THE ORIGINAL IN POSSESSION OF MRS MC GAVIN.





THE  
**Protestant.**

No. CXXXII.

---

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20th, 1821.

---

JUVENIS is beyond comparison the most respectable antagonist who has entered the lists with THE PROTESTANT. I feel pleasure in replying to his objections, because I think he has both understanding to apprehend, and candour to admit the force of certain facts and arguments which I have brought to bear upon the controversy which I am maintaining against his Church. The fragment of his letter which I inserted in my last Number, gives me an opportunity of explaining, and entering more fully into the discussion of some important points than I have hitherto done, though I may have slightly touched upon them. Of this opportunity I gladly avail myself; and I hope the remarks which I am about to make, in addition to those in my last Number, will not be considered uninteresting or irrelevant.

I had professed myself ready to pay all due respect to the fathers, as witnesses of matters of fact which came under their own observation, so far as they gave a consistent testimony. "This," says Juvenis, "comes at once to the true nature of the question; I cited the fathers not as *judges* or expounders of the sense of scripture, but as witnesses of the belief of the times in which they lived; those times which *are declared to have taught the faith delivered by the apostles.*" Before proceeding farther I must ask, who are they that have declared what I have given in italics at the conclusion of the last sentence? If I shall be referred to Bishop Morton, or any author of his age, or since his age, I must reject him, and all such, as incompetent witnesses. They declare what they have not seen with their eyes, or heard with their ears. They

know nothing of the matter but what they have learned from the very fathers, who are themselves adduced as witnesses in the same cause, and they cannot add the weight of a straw to their testimony. If the fathers have written, merely in general terms, that the faith of the apostles was purely taught in their time, it is no more than any cardinal in Rome would assert, and swear to at this very day. We know what would be the value of such an assertion, even when confirmed by oath. The cardinal might sincerely believe what he swore, and the fathers no doubt wrote what they believed to be true : but they merely express what was their own opinion of the matter ; and in weighing evidence on such a subject, their opinion ought to have no more weight than that of any Protestant peasant who asserts, perhaps truly, that his minister teaches the faith as it was delivered by the apostles.

If the fathers, instead of barely asserting that the faith of Christ was purely taught in their times, which is in fact asserting no more than that the system which they held was the predominant one ;— If, I say, instead of this, they go into details, and give us a summary of the doctrines which were then generally taught, I hold them competent witnesses of the fact, when two or three of them in the same age, agree in asserting it. I hold this as sufficient evidence that such and such doctrines were generally believed, and such forms of worship as they describe generally practised in the ages to which they refer. I made considerable use of this sort of evidence when I attempted to show that transubstantiation was a novelty, by quoting passages from the ancient fathers, which clearly proved that they, and the churches in their time, had no idea of the substance of the bread in the Lord's Supper being converted into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. This sort of argument, however, does not go to prove that transubstantiation is contrary to scripture, (which is proved by other arguments) but merely that it was unknown to the fathers and the primitive churches.

To know what the Church of Rome, or any other church held as matter of faith, in any age subsequent to that of the apostles, is interesting to us merely as a matter of history. That certain articles were believed by the Church of Rome, in the second, third, and fourth centuries, is no evidence that such articles were taught by the apostles, unless we have the apostles' own word for it, in their own writings ; and, if we have this, we receive such articles as the truth of God independently of the authority of the church, and whether she believed them or not. From the apostle Paul himself we learn, that a prevalent doctrine, believed and taught in the churches in Galatia, was, that in order to salvation, it was necessary to be circumcised, and to keep the law of Moses. Here is an unimpeachable witness of the fact, that such a doctrine generally prevailed, not near



the apostolic age merely, but while many of the apostles were yet alive; but the fact is adduced, not to prove the truth of the doctrine, but to show the defection of those churches from the faith of the gospel. Papists adduce many facts asserted by less credible witnesses, to prove that certain tenets were taught and generally believed, some ages after the apostles had gone to their rest; but admitting the testimony to be true, it proves only that the Christians of those ages had departed from the faith of Christ, not that the tenets so maintained belonged to this faith. When it is ascertained, that many churches departed from the simplicity of the gospel, while they were under the keen discerning eye of inspired apostles, how much more must not this have been the case, in the course of ages, when not favoured with such superintendence, and when exposed to the silent intrusion, and malign influence of worldly men, who soon began to insinuate themselves into the churches, and who actually filled that of Rome whenever Christianity became respectable in the eyes of the world?

I hope Juvenis, on reflection, will be convinced that there is no wisdom in suffering his mind to be entangled by the traditions of the fathers, which, unless supported by scripture, are absolutely useless; and which, if even so supported, are of little use, because the authority of the word of God is enough without them.

I am sorry, however, to observe that Juvenis, like most persons of his communion, does not seem to regard the scriptures with the respect to which they are entitled. "As the sacred volume," says he, "in the point in question, as well as in many others, is liable to two interpretations, of a meaning directly opposite, what proof, I again ask, can we have which is the true one, but by referring to the belief of the Christian churches in those ages which are allowed to have had the faith in the same purity as it was delivered?" This argument rests upon the assumption of its being *allowed* that there were churches in certain ages after the apostles, who held the faith as purely as the apostles delivered it. This, however, is not *allowed*, but positively denied. There were not many churches that remained pure during the apostolic age; and there is no evidence of *any* having done so for any considerable period thereafter. Therefore, the argument which Juvenis builds upon this assumption falls to the ground.

But I have a more serious complaint against my correspondent. He seems to consider the Bible as inferior, in point of perspicuity, and less to be depended upon, than the writings of uninspired men. It is liable, he says, to two interpretations, of a meaning directly opposite; and his words imply that the writings of the fathers are not liable to this abuse, seeing that from them can be learned without danger of mistake, what cannot be so learned from the Bible. His words must mean this, else they mean nothing in

relation to the point in hand. Now I would seriously request the writer of this to reflect deliberately upon what his words imply, and consider whether they do not at least approach to the sin of blaspheming the Holy Ghost. I do not say in that sense in which it is declared that such a sin shall not be forgiven; but they certainly do appear to impeach the power and the fidelity of the Holy Spirit, 'in dictating to, and guiding the pens of inspired men.' I am persuaded this thought never occurred to my correspondent, else he would not have suffered such words to flow from his pen. In him therefore, I hope, it is only a sin of ignorance or inadvertence.

All scripture is given by inspiration of God; and holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. This is the testimony of apostles on behalf of prophets and their writings; and that the apostles themselves wrote under the same influence is evident from Christ's promise of his Spirit to be with them, to lead them into all truth, so that they should infallibly speak and write the truth in his name. Now it would be the greatest blasphemy to say, that the Divine Spirit could not enable these men to write in language at least as plain and perspicuous as other men; and it would be as great blasphemy to say that he purposely dictated language susceptible of a double meaning; for this would be to counteract the gracious design of Christ, who commanded his gospel to be published for the instruction and salvation of the simple, the ignorant, the poor, and miserable. But how could the gospel produce this effect, if it were expressed in language so equivocal as to bear opposite meanings? This is the accusation which Juvenis brings against the inspired writings; and if it were true, it would set aside the authority and use of the Bible altogether.

In another part of his letter, Juvenis writes, "The Bible would doubtlessly be the only rule in matters of religion, if it were sufficiently plain on all points of Christian doctrine; but as unfortunately this is not the case, the inspired writer himself telling us, that there are many parts hard to be understood, which many wrest to their own destruction; and which we ourselves see made to answer the most opposite opinions: in these circumstances, there surely can be no impropriety in referring to the writings of those who lived in purer times," &c. I might here ask Juvenis what he means by *purer times*? I understood him to undertake the task of showing that his church is as pure now as ever she was. If she is not, he admits the necessity of a Reformation; for surely there can be nothing more proper; nay, there can be nothing more imperative on a church, than to return to the purity from which she has departed. But waving this for the present, I return to my correspondent's assertion about the insufficiency of the Bible as a rule in matters of religion. He plainly asserts,

that it is not “*sufficiently* plain on all points of Christian doctrine.” That is, in plain English, the Bible is not *sufficient* for the purpose intended by it. It is the word of God indeed; for this is not controverted. It declares itself able to make us wise unto salvation,—and to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works; and yet, says Juvenis, it is not *sufficiently plain* on all points of Christian doctrine. It declares itself sufficient for the salvation of sinners and the perfecting of saints; and what more would my correspondent have? If he means that it is not sufficient to make men Papists, it is readily granted; and then I have no more controversy with him on this point. I leave him engaged in a controversy with the Word of God; and wo to the man that striveth with his Maker! I suspect Juvenis, from his hand-writing, to be a man of the law. If he should find an Act of Parliament not “sufficiently plain” to guide the decision of the Court of Session in a matter in which his property, or the property of his client was interested, would he not complain bitterly of the stupidity of our legislators? and yet, in matters which affect the eternal salvation of millions of human beings, he coolly declares the word of God not to be “sufficiently plain.” This is an impeachment of the wisdom and goodness of his Creator, such as he would scarcely venture to make against a fellow-creature a little above him in civil authority.

The Apostle Peter tells us, that in the epistles of Paul, there are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned wrest to their own destruction; but these very words of Peter have been wrested more than any other passage in the Bible to the destruction of those who so wrest them. In all their books of controversy,—in all their catechisms,—in almost all the letters which I have received from Papists, and in this one of Juvenis among the rest, these words of the apostle are wrested to support a doctrine which he never meant to inculcate; namely, that the Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith and manners; but that we must add to it, in one form or another, the doctrines and traditions of men. For a full discussion of this subject, I refer the reader to my first volume, page 283, in which I showed that certain things are “hard to be understood,” not because the things themselves are unintelligible; but because some men’s minds are so occupied with opposite things that they cannot receive them.

I expect Juvenis will reply to what I have said about his blasphemous assertion, that the words of the Holy Ghost are not *sufficiently plain*, by explaining himself thus;—that he did not mean to say, that the words of the Bible are not plain enough; but that the things spoken of are so mysterious, and “hard to be understood,” that the words used cannot convey an adequate idea of them to our minds. This, in reference to some points, will be



granted. The Bible tells us of things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and which have not entered into the mind of man. But surely, if the words of the apostles, dictated by the Holy Ghost, be not "*sufficiently plain*" upon these things, whose words can be so? Juvenis will tell me, that we may come to the understanding of these things by reading the works of certain fathers who lived in purer times, and who have borne witness to the faith of the churches in those times. But if the things themselves were incapable of being so expressed by words as to make men understand them, how came the fathers to express them intelligibly? Where did they find words which apostles under divine inspiration could not find, to make men understand the "things hard to be understood?"

The truth is, the Bible is unspeakably more plain than the plainest and wisest of the fathers. He that comes to it with simplicity and singleness of heart, really desiring to know how he may obtain the pardon of his sins, and the salvation of his soul, shall soon find what he is seeking. Nothing can be plainer than the divine declaration, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life."—"The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost."—And "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Any one of these three sentences comprises the sum and substance of the whole Bible; and the meaning is so plain, that it is impossible for any man who understands the terms, to make the words speak opposite meanings, without an artful and wilful perversion of them. The man, woman, or child, who believes the truth expressed by the above words, shall undoubtedly be saved: and if they are not "*sufficiently plain*," let Juvenis point out a passage in any of the fathers that is more so. Let it be remembered, the grand business of a divinely taught religion, is the salvation of the soul. The Bible, from first to last, points to Jesus Christ and to none else; and to say that it is not "*sufficiently plain*" on this subject, is as absurd, and more impious, than to assert that the sun is not sufficiently bright to give light to the world. The writings of the fathers are full of a vain philosophy derived from the school of Plato, and other heathen sources, by means of which they corrupted the gospel, and prepared the way for all the errors that have defiled the church of Rome for more than fifteen hundred years. Juvenis, and all others of his communion, profess to have recourse to these writers, that they may learn what Christianity is, which is as foolish as to seek for the pure water of a fountain in the muddy streams of a river that has imbibed the filth of all the common sewers of a great city. By filtration, such water may, indeed, be

rendered subservient to the ordinary purposes of life ; and by a similar process, the writings of the fathers may be made to yield a few drops which manifest their relation to the fountain ; but what wise man would be at the pains to filtrate so much impurity, when he has access every day and every hour to the pure fountain itself ?

Juvenis represents me as wishing to know what proof there is that the writings referred to are the genuine writings of the fathers ? But this is not putting the question fairly. I do not deny that there is as much evidence of the genuineness of Origen's, or Cyprian's or any other father's writings, as there is of those of Livy and Xenophon. But I asked Juvenis, or rather suggested for his consideration, a doubt, whether the *editions* of the works of the fathers from which he quoted were genuine ? And here I must remind him of a little deficiency of that candour which I expected from him. I stated a fact, that his church had mutilated the works of the fathers, by her Index Expurgatorius. He knows the fact as well as I do, else he must be a mere tyro in ecclesiastical history ; but he has not the candour to acknowledge it ; neither has he the boldness to deny it ; but he tries to evade the question, by asking whether the Greek church had none of the writings of the fathers ? and whether they would not have been as careful in preserving them from mutilation, and in being a check upon the Church of Rome, as much in regard to them as with regard to the Bible ? Now it is enough for me to reply, that I do not know that the writings of the fathers, at least the Latin ones, were very generally possessed by the Greek churches ; but supposing they were so, I do not know, and I do not believe, that these churches considered them of equal value with the Holy Scriptures, or of any value at all, and therefore they might give themselves little concern whether the Church of Rome mutilated them or not. It is a fact that this holy church did mutilate them, and expunge from them those passages which she considered unfavourable to her errors and usurpations. If Juvenis shall venture to deny this, I can refer him to some public libraries, in which he may witness with his own eyes that I speak the truth. But he knows the fact too well to deny it. Then, I ask, why does he put a case with regard to the Greek churches, which is evidently intended to throw a doubt upon the subject, as if he meant to deny it ? This is not like the candour which we should expect to find in the advocates of a good cause.

Who the eminent divines of the Established Church, to whom Juvenis refers, are, I do not know ; and of the merits of the catechism which he quotes, I am equally ignorant. But if there be a respectable divine of the Church of Scotland, who can seriously adduce the opinions of the Christians of the first ages, to

prove the obligation of observing the Lord's Supper till the end of the world, I would tell him, that he practises the folly of those who seek from the living to the dead. The living Saviour commands his disciples to show forth his death *until he come*; and what authority can the opinions of Christians who died seventeen hundred years ago add to this injunction?

Juvenis adheres to his opinion, that the Christians of the first ages, living in purer times, must have had better opportunities than we have of knowing the true meaning of the apostolic writings on doubtful points; but he does not reply to the remarks which I made on that subject, which must, therefore, be considered as unrefuted. He shows no reason why we of the present day may not understand a Greek sentence, or any number of Greek sentences, written by apostles in the first century, as easily as any number of Latin sentences written by any of the fathers in the following centuries. We must depend upon writing in either case; and according to approved rules of evidence, the first or earliest writing is most to be depended upon.

Here again Juvenis' good sense leads him to admit that the first ages of his church were "purer times" than the present; but how can he admit this, and deny the necessity of reformation? Luther and other reformers avowed it to be their purpose to return to the purity of the first ages; and every man who admits that these *were* purer ages, ought to applaud the attempt; though the bold undertakers did not succeed in every point, perhaps because they did not go far enough back.

After all, according to Juvenis, it is only "doubtful points," which those who lived in purer times had better opportunities of understanding than we have. But those parts of the Bible which directly regard the salvation of a sinner, and how he shall live to the glory of God, are not doubtful points, but very plain. And those parts which are most difficult or doubtful, regard chiefly the fulfilment of prophecy, which we certainly ought to understand much better than the most enlightened uninspired men of the first ages. Nay, it may be questioned whether the apostles themselves had such an understanding of some of the prophecies which they uttered and wrote, as the weakest Christian has since they have been fulfilled in the rise, and reign, and begun downfall of the Man of Sin. The possession of the prophetic spirit did not necessarily imply a full understanding of what was prophesied, see 1 Pet. i. 10—12, particularly v. 12.



THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CXXXIII.

~~~~~  
*SATURDAY, JANUARY 27th, 1821.*  
~~~~~

I HAVE paid my correspondent, Juvenis, the compliment of devoting two Numbers to an extract of a letter from him, and remarks upon it. I think I have replied to every thing in that extract which called for particular notice ; but there is a principle avowed in it, which, I think, requires to be discussed by itself ; that is, the insufficiency of the word of God, as a rule of faith, worship, and manners. Juvenis repeatedly declares that he does not consider the Bible sufficiently plain to instruct him ; and he pleads for the admission of human authority, or human teaching, to make him certain of what he ought to believe, and what to practise in the way of religious worship. In other words, he will not receive the Bible, but in the sense in which certain men who lived hundreds of years ago received it.

This is in fact subjecting the word of God to the authority of man. Those who are thus regarded as judges in the matter, are called fathers, and some of them have the word saint prefixed to their names. It is not pretended that they were inspired men like apostles and evangelists ; and yet the Church of Rome sets them as judges over inspired men, insomuch that apostles and evangelists shall be allowed to speak only through their medium ; and the words of the divine record shall not be allowed to have any meaning but such as they please to impose upon them.

Juvenis is not one of those who deny that the Bible is the word of God. In arguing with him, I have hitherto proceeded upon the assumption that this was admitted by him ; but it is admitted in such a way as to show that it has little authority in his esteem. Every work of God is perfect in its kind, and fit for every purpose intended by it. I take this to be an axiom that does not require to be proved ; and no man can deny it without landing himself in atheism. Now, God is said to have magnified his *word* above all his name, Psal. cxxxviii. 2. He has set his seal upon it, and given such displays of himself in it, as he has not done by any other medium, not even by the sun and the moon, which he hath ordained. These perfectly serve the purpose which he ordained them to serve, which is merely of a temporal nature ; and shall it be seriously maintained, that his word is not sufficient to serve the infinitely more important purpose intended by it ? Yes ; Juvenis maintains this, and so far as I know, all Papists maintain it. In their esteem the word of God is not “sufficiently plain” to teach men the way of salvation. It is liable to misconstruction. It is made to speak different and even opposite meanings ; and the

inference is, that no dependence ought to be placed upon it, except so far as the fathers of the church have given it their sanction.

Now, let Papists cavil and shuffle as they may, this amounts to a virtual denial of the Bible as the word of God. To say that it is so, and in the same breath to say it is not "*sufficiently plain*," is such an impeachment of the divine wisdom and goodness, as we shall never hear but from the most hardened infidel, or from those who, like Juvenis, perhaps, have breathed the atmosphere of infidelity, and have become so familiar with its phraseology, as to make use of it without being aware of its import. Juvenis will spurn the idea of being classed with infidels; and nothing would have induced me to have associated him with them, but his attempt to disparage the word of God, which is most effectually to promote the cause of infidelity.

It does not properly belong to my plan to discuss the subject of the inspiration, and divine authority of the holy Scriptures. This has been done of late years, to good purpose, by different authors; and none deserve more honourable mention than two divines of our own city. The names of Dick and Chalmers will instantly occur to every reader acquainted with the literature of the present age; and referring to the "Essay on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures," by the former, and the "Evidence and Authority of the Christian Revelation," by the latter, I might confidently leave that question to the decision of every intelligent and candid reader. I have indeed, in general, proceeded upon the assumption that Papists admit the divine authority of the Bible; but the more intimately I have become acquainted with them, and the more closely I have come to grapple with their secret and avowed principles, I have been the more convinced that I have assumed what is not heartily conceded by them. The complaint of Juvenis, that the Bible is not sufficiently plain, has confirmed what I inferred from the writings of Mr. Andrews and his correspondents, (who bewail the dreadful mischiefs which arise from Bible reading) namely, that the Bible itself is regarded by Papists, not with reverence as the word of God, but held in abhorrence as the most pernicious book in the world.

The last named author has repeatedly challenged me, in his "Catholic Vindicator" to tell him how I come to know the Bible to be the word of God; and the train of his reasoning, if such it can be called, is, to show that no man can know this but upon the authority of the Church of Rome. This holy church, it seems, claims the power of deciding infallibly what is the word of God, and what is not; or, which comes nearly to the same thing, she alone has power and authority to declare the true meaning of the Scriptures. In her infallible wisdom, she pretends to prove from the Bible that she possesses this authority, and yet the Bible itself has no authority or meaning but what she is pleased to allow it; which exemplifies the absurdity of proving a thing by itself, or two things mutually by one another. Juvenis is entitled to an apology

for classing him with such a writer as Mr. Andrews, whose name as an author is not worthy to appear on the same page; but as they are agreed in maintaining the insufficiency of the Bible, which I hold to be virtually the same thing as rejecting its inspiration, I shall, before entering upon another general topic of discussion, devote a Number or two to the answering of the question, how I know the Bible to be the word of God? I shall first, however, give the challenge itself, in the words of the Vindicator, from different parts of his work.

“As the accuser,” says he, meaning the Protestant, “speaks positively to the Scriptures containing the word of God, will he permit me to inquire of him how he came by the information, and upon what authority he grounds his assertion? Has *he* been taken into the council of the Almighty, that *he* should know more of his will than other men?” (so it seems other men do not know that the Bible contains the word of God!) “Has *he* been favoured with a revelation from heaven in his private ear? Or has a heavenly messenger been sent to *him*, to inform him that the Bible is actually the word of God?” *Cath. Vind. col. 233.* Some of these expressions had been used by me, when inquiring how the Popish priests came to know the mind of God better than other men, *independently of the Bible*; and here the Vindicator makes use of my words to inquire how I came to know the truth of the Bible itself; from which it is evident that, in his opinion, there is no way of knowing it, but by the authority of his church, or by means of a private communication by an angelic messenger sent from heaven.

The author introduces a long extract from his infallible oracle Dr. Milner, intended to show that Protestants cannot be certain with regard to any book in the Bible that it is genuine. The extract concludes thus:—“Granting, for example, that St. Paul wrote an inspired epistle to the Romans, and another to the Ephesians, yet, as the former was intrusted to an individual, the Deaconess Phebe, to be conveyed by her to its destination, (Rom. xvi. see Calmet, &c.) and the latter to his disciple, Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21.) for the same purpose, it is impossible for you to entertain a rational conviction that these epistles, as they stand in your Testament, are exactly in the state in which they issued from the apostle’s pen, or that they are his genuine epistles at all, without recurring to the tradition and authority of the Catholic Church concerning them,” *Ibid. col. 237.* This is an argument truly worthy of a Popish vicar apostolic and bishop of the 19th century. Supposing Phebe to have been the bearer of the epistle to the Romans, and supposing her to have been sufficiently well acquainted with Greek learning, and such an expert penwoman as to imitate the hand-writing of Tertius in the body of the epistle, and of Paul in the salutation, so as to deceive the Christians in Rome, it may be asked, what motive she could have to make her practise such imposition? The venerable vicar apostolic means



to insinuate, that for any thing we Protestants know, this said Phebe destroyed Paul's epistle, or having by accident lost it on the way, wrote one out of her own head, and palmed it upon the Christians in Rome as the genuine writing of the apostle, and that this is what we have in our New Testaments at this day! And truly if it were so, I would say that Phebe was a greater woman than the Virgin Mary, or any other woman that ever appeared in the world. But this is an argument, which, from its extreme absurdity, it is difficult to answer. If we were to allow the bishop's doubts in such a case as this to have any weight, we could not be sure of the genuineness of any writing;—we could not put faith in written documents of any kind. But to proceed with the Catholic Vindicator:—

“By what private stamp,” says he, “or mark, does THE PROTESTANT learn that the Bible is the word of God? By what influence, and by what means, can he ascertain the accuracy of the Scriptures, but on the *testimony of others*, on the *traditions* of men, as he himself admits in the passage I have before quoted; unless, indeed, as I observed in a former Vindicator, he can show that he has been favoured with a copy from some heavenly messenger, in which case he would do well to present it to the Bible Society, for general distribution, with his own authenticated signature.” *Cath. Vind. col. 261.* Here the Vindicator introduces me as admitting that I could not ascertain the accuracy of the Scriptures, but on the testimony of others,—on the traditions of men; and he professes to refer to my own words, which he had before quoted, as containing such admission; but he takes care not to refer to any page of his own work or mine in which such words are to be found; and the fact is, I never admitted any such thing. I do not reject human testimony in weighing what are called the *external* evidences of the authenticity of the Scriptures; but no words of mine express, or even imply such an admission as that which the Vindicator asserts; and this is one of the numberless impositions which he was pleased to practise upon his readers, in order to defend a cause which cannot be defended without having recourse to falsehood and imposition.

The hostility of Papists against the Bible will appear more evidently from the following extract. I had asserted that the Bible contains a complete revelation of the will of God for the salvation of our fallen race;—that it contains a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners; and that it ought to be accessible to all men. To this the Vindicator, after quoting our Lord's words (Go teach all nations, &c. Mat. xxviii. 20—21) replies:—“Now here is no intimation of *reading* in these words of our Saviour, nor can THE PROTESTANT discover that the Son of God ever *wrote* his divine precepts previous to sending the apostles on their commission. Upon what grounds then can he fairly establish his position, that the *Bible* was intended to be *accessible to all men*? It was not accessible to all the Israelites;

it was not accessible to all the Gentiles ; it was not accessible to all the primitive Christians ; it is not accessible to *all* men at the present day ; nor will it be accessible to *all* men in future ages, notwithstanding the active but ill-judged labours of the Bible Societies to disseminate it. 'For,' says an article in *The Times* London Newspaper, of the 9th of April last, 'it is a curious fact, that, supposing the British and Foreign Bible Society were to distribute as many copies of the Scriptures *each year*, as they have done during the last *twelve years*, wherein 1,675,994 copies have been circulated, it would still take *four centuries* to supply each individual in the world with a copy ; and this is taking it for granted that the inhabitants of the countries called Christian are already supplied.' By this, (says the Vindicator,) the reader will see the groundlessness of the charge of *withholding* the Bible from the people, brought by THE PROTESTANT against the Church of Rome, seeing that it is an act of impossibility to supply all men with copies of it, were she so inclined. Consequently, if restricting those from reading the Bible, who are likely to *pervert* the sense of it to their *own destruction*, which is all the fathers of the Council of Trent meditated, in the before-mentioned decree, be 'the same thing as granting permission to creatures to *hear* what the Almighty *speaks* to them ;' if the *Bible* contains 'a *complete* revelation of his will for the salvation of our fallen race ;' if 'it is a *proclamation* of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners ;' (what nonsense !) God himself must stand accused by THE PROTESTANT of denying the use of the Bible to the common people, and preventing 'fallen and miserable creatures from hearing what he says to them,' which I apprehend comes nearer to blasphemy than the words of my correspondent before alluded to, seeing he has ordained that the greater portion of mankind, from the creation to the present day, have been, are now, and will be deprived of the supposed blessing of *reading* this wonderful Protestant *panacea*, not only from their inability to procure a copy, but also from the want of a knowledge of letters." *Cath. Vind. col. 240.*

The above are the sentiments of the champion whom our Glasgow Papists engaged to defend them against the exposure which THE PROTESTANT was making of their Antichristian principles. They must of course be held as the sentiments of our Papists themselves until they disavow them. This is a fair specimen of Mr. Andrews' mode of reasoning. He has scarcely a paragraph that contains better logic. I shall not analyze the passage at present ; but I request such of my readers as have leisure, to try what they can make out of it. One thing appears certain upon the very face of it, that the circulation and general reading of the Bible is regarded with dread and abhorrence by our modern Papists, whatever some credulous Glasgow Protestants may say to the contrary.

I shall give an extract or two more from the Vindicator before I proceed to a particular reply ; but I am afraid some of my readers will regard these quotations, which speak in such terms of the

holy Scriptures, as no better than the filth of the inquisition, with which I have lately treated them *ad nauseam*. I had said that the apostles committed to writing what was dictated by the Holy Ghost; and that the word of God thus written, they threw upon the world, and the providence of him who gave it, to supply the place of their voice, after they should be dead. To this the Vindicator replies:—"Now the transactions here related must have occurred near 1800 years ago; but what other evidence of his senses can THE PROTESTANT produce, as a voucher for this statement, than the Papist for his belief in transubstantiation?" THE PROTESTANT never spoke of the evidence of his senses in this matter; but the Vindicator assumes that he did, and proceeds upon the false assumption. "Did he *see* the Holy Spirit guide the pens of the writers? What evidence of his senses has he to produce, that the apostles wrote the books of the New Testament, or that they were written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit? A Bible is placed before him, which in itself is a mere book; *how* then does he know that it is a divine book? I have shown that this book is liable to be corrupted—that it has been corrupted—that the unfaithfulness of the Protestant translations is notorious, not only for the multitude, but the grossness of their infidelities: how then can he assert upon the evidence of his senses," (which he never did) "that the *Bible is the word of God*, which is immutable, and not subject to variation? 'Heaven and earth shall pass away,' says our Saviour, 'but my words shall not pass away.' We have the evidence of our senses that the translations of the Bible by Protestants vary with each other, and in many places even to the perverting of the meaning: by *what* means then, I call upon my adversary to state, is *he* enabled to prove that the Bible is the word of God, according to the *evidence of his senses*? How can *he* verify the genuine from the adulterated version?" (This is another question, artfully thrown in to lead away the reader's mind from the main point; about how we come to know the Bible to be the word of God.) "He says, the apostles committed the word of God to *writing*, because their living voice could not reach the millions of men scattered over the face of the earth, and therefore they were inspired to write the *whole* truth of God for the salvation of sinners, and the edification of those who, by means of it, should be saved from their sins. This word, thus written, *they threw* upon the world. Now the concurring testimony of all ages contradicts this assertion of THE PROTESTANT, as I have shown in my 17th Vindicator, col. 263, by proving that the millions of men scattered over the face of the earth, were favoured with the truths of the gospel by the *preaching* of men, who succeeded the apostles in their ministry, and not by the *written* epistles which some of the latter left behind them. But if it was the intention of our divine Saviour, that his word should be thrown promiscuously upon the world, after the death of the apostles, how did it happen that only *five* of them, who were personally chosen by himself, left written documents behind them? Two of the gospels, and the



Acts of the Apostles, were written by men who were not members of the sacred college ; and one of them, St. Luke, acknowledges that he wrote from *hearsay*. What evidence then has THE PROTESTANT to show, other than his bare assertion, for the accuracy of his statement ? Again, he says, they committed the word to writing, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who guided their pens as he did their tongues, to declare the WHOLE TRUTH of God ; and yet one of the apostles, St. John, concludes his gospel with this truly important declaration, well worthy the consideration of those who contend that *the Bible, and the Bible only*, is their rule of faith, namely, ‘there are also *many other things which Jesus did*, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the *world itself could not contain the books which should be written.*’—*Cath. Vind. col. 326—328.*

I suppose ordinary readers will not be able to perceive what relation these words of the apostle John have to the subject ; or why the words which Jesus spoke, and which his apostles wrote, should not be the only rule of faith, in connexion with those of Moses and the prophets, because *all* the things which Jesus *did* were not written down.

As I cannot conveniently enter upon an answer to the challenge of the Vindicator at the conclusion of a Number, I must reserve it for my next : and I shall conclude the present one with a specimen of the manner in which the translators of the Bible into English, are said, according to Mr. Andrews, to have corrupted the word of God ; and by means of which, to use his own language, they have made it “the word of the Devil,” see *Cath. Vind. col. 282.* His remarks refer chiefly to the translations made in the reign of Elizabeth ; and his first complaint is that the word “Catholic,” which is a Greek word, signifying universal, or general, has not been retained in the title of certain epistles, but has been translated into English, as the *general* epistle of James, &c. This, it seems, is a grievous corruption of the New Testament. The Vindicator finds that it would not have served the purpose of the Reformers to expel the word “Catholic” from the New Testament, if they allowed the word “Church” to remain ; therefore, he finds that in the edition of 1560, the word church never appeared, but congregation was uniformly used. He does not know, I suppose, that the Greek word *ἐκκλησία* literally signifies congregation as well as church ; and that the words are synonymous. Be this as it may, the latter word “church” was restored to its place by the translators of our present authorised version ; and therefore our English Bible is not corrupt in this respect. The following are the very words of the Vindicator, in reference to other corruptions :—“As they obliterated the *Catholic Church*, so did they also the name of *priest* turning it into *elder*, and the *priesthood* into *eldership*. As in St. James v. 14. ‘If any be diseased among you, let him call for the elders of the *congregation*.’ (Bible 1560.) Acts xiv. 23. ‘When they had ordained them *elders by election* in every *congregation*.’ (Bible 1560.) These words, *by election*, were

thrust into the text by Tindal, in King Henry VIIIth's time, and retained in it by Cranmer, and all the pretended reformers of King Edward VIth's reign : so here in Queen Elizabeth's Bibles, as may be seen in these editions of 1560, 1577, 1579, 1598, 1599. Nor were they obliterated till King James I. made a new translation."—*Cath. Vind. col.* 286. Let it be admitted that the words "by election," were an unnecessary supplement, the thing was corrected by the translators of the present version, and ought not now to be laid to the charge of English Protestants : but when did the Church of Rome ever correct a mistake into which she had fallen ? Other great corruptions alleged against our translators are, that they have used the word *gift* instead of *grace* in several places ; that in reference to Christ's "benediction or consecration of the holy sacrament," instead of *blessed or blessing*, the words "gave thanks," are used. Instead of "confess your sins," our translators have said "acknowledge your faults," which is another great corruption, and tends to set aside the sacrament of confession. *Repentance* has been put in the place of *penance*. "To dishonour and disgrace our blessed Lady the mother of God," says Mr. Andrews, "they turn the angel's salutation, St. Luke, i. 28. which was, *Hail, full of grace*, into, *Hail, thou art freely beloved*." Instead of *idols*, our translators have inserted *images*, in a number of passages, which is another horrible corruption. Other corruptions are the use of the word *grave* instead of *hell* in some passages ; *ordinances* and *instructions*, instead of *traditions* ; *love* instead of *charity*. For *sacrament*, they have substituted *mystery* ; for *baptism*, *washing* ; for *angel*, *messenger* ; for *apostle*, *ambassador* ; for *Christ*, *anointed* ; for *Holy Ghost*, *holy wind*.

The above is a complete catalogue of the corruptions which our modern champion of Popery has been able to muster, in his 18th Number, to discredit our English translation of the Bible, and prove it to be not the word of God, but "the word of the Devil." In some subsequent Numbers he gives a few more cases of equal, but not greater importance. I cannot imagine a greater compliment to our translation than this. In most of the cases, what he calls corruptions and mistranslations, are really true renderings of the original Greek ; but though it were otherwise, the things are so unimportant, that the mistranslations, had they been such, could have led no man into error, either in doctrine or practice. And we may be sure that had the Vindicator, or his oracle and patron, Bishop Milner, been able to point out any really mischievous errors in our translation, it would have been done. Any biblical scholar may be able to point out more important mistakes than any of the above, in the best translation of the Bible that was ever made, not excepting *the infallible* Vulgate ; and yet no one of these mistakes,—not even the whole taken together, will be found to affect any Christian doctrine, or ordinance of Christian worship.

THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CXXXIV.

~~~~~  
*SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3d. 1821.*  
~~~~~

PAPISTS maintain that we do not know the Bible to be the word of God, but upon the testimony of the Church of Rome : but this church is so much given to lying, that I would question the truth of any thing that was made to rest upon her sole authority. Liars are suspected even when they speak the truth ; and if the authenticity of the sacred writings depended upon the assertion of the Church of Rome, I suspect there are many who would reject them on that account alone, without inquiring into the merits, or considering the excellence of the writings themselves. This, however, would not be fair. The writings of the apostles were possessed by the churches in general at a very early period. The Church of Rome, like other churches, came into the possession of them ; and it is granted that she preserved them in a Latin version, locked up from the view of the profane vulgar, for several hundred years. Some of her refractory children, such as Wickliffe and Luther, compelled her at last to acknowledge that she had such writings in her possession. They had seen them ; they began to give versions of them in the language of the common people ; and the church at last was obliged to bring them out to public view, but, at first, in a Latin version only, with an authoritative canon, declaring this to be equal to the Greek original. And, from the circumstance of having been so long in the undisturbed possession of the book, she began to claim it as her own, and so gave it out as her own ; and hence it is that she now pretends to dictate with supreme authority with regard to its meaning, and even whether it be the word of God or not.

This reminds me of what was remarked of Phebe in my last Number. She is said to have been the bearer of the epistle which Paul wrote to the Christians in Rome. Now, supposing she had kept the epistle in her own possession for a great number of years, and had at last, in her old age, after Paul was dead, brought it forth to public view ; and supposing she had insisted upon the believers in Rome receiving it upon her bare word, what does the reader suppose would have been the consequence ? The Christians would probably have felt very indignant ; they would have



expressed great displeasure against the said Phebe, for having kept them so long in the dark with regard to such a valuable document ; and they would, perhaps, have told her that she had done so ill, by keeping back the letter, that they would not take her bare word for any thing. They take the letter however ; they examine the seal, and the hand-writing of Tertius, with whom some of them had been acquainted, and the hand-writing of Paul himself in the salutation, which was his token in every epistle ; and, above all, they examine the contents, and compare them with other writings of the same apostle, and with what they had heard from his own mouth ; they unanimously conclude that the epistle is the genuine production of him whose name it bears, and they receive it as such. Phebe might boast that it had been received on her sole authority ; but this would have exposed her to the derision of every Christian in Rome, and would have rendered her own Christianity somewhat doubtful. Now, admitting the highest that the Church of Rome can justly claim on this subject, she was merely for a time one of the depositaries of the scriptures ; and when she was pleased, or rather compelled, to bring them forth to public view, she could add nothing to their authority, any more than the bearer of a letter can add to the authority of its contents, of the authenticity of which the person addressed is, on other grounds, perfectly satisfied.

These remarks, I hope, will be considered a sufficient reply to what Papists advance with regard to their church being invested with the power of deciding infallibly what is, and what is not, the word of God. If they could show that the Church of Rome had received some special grant of authority on this subject, from the Head of the church, it would become every Christian to submit to it : but as nothing of the kind has been shown, I shall continue to consider the decision of the Church of Rome of no more weight than the opinion of Jack or Tom, or any self-sufficient pedant who may pretend to understand all mysteries, and to possess all knowledge.

The works to which I referred in my last Number prove, in the most convincing manner, according to the laws of moral and literary evidence, that the Holy Scriptures are what they profess to be ; namely, the testimony of God, conveyed to men by the ministry of his accredited ambassadors. The arguments of such authors are sufficient to silence every objector ; to prevail upon every candid mind to give the Bible a fair hearing, by perusing it with serious attention : and if this does not lead to an acknowledgment that it is the word of God, the failure will be found to arise, not from the want of evidence, but from a certain indisposition of the mind and heart, by which many disqualify themselves from attending to the evidence which is presented. And it is possible for a man to be overcome by such evidence, so far as to acknowledge the Bible to

be the word of God,—to have a rational conviction that it is what it professes to be,—and yet, in an evangelical sense, not to “know the truth ;” or be able to satisfy others, or even himself, when he is required to say upon what grounds he *knows* the Bible to be the word of God. The Catholic Vindicator seems to believe that no man can know this, unless he were to receive a Bible directly from the hand of his Maker, or see the Holy Spirit guide the pens of the men that wrote it ; for which, see my last Number. It is not probable that any thing that I can write will have much weight with such men as he ; but for the information of others, I shall proceed to show how any man may, and how every Christian does, know the Bible to be the word of God, independently of the authority of any man, or of any church, in the world.

Men are the offspring of God, and his workmanship ; and he has endowed them with certain faculties, by which they are enabled to perceive his work where it appears before their eyes, or is presented to their minds. I grant that by sin these faculties have become extremely depraved ; insomuch, that it is doubtful whether they would be able, without revelation, to discover, from the works of creation, that there is a God. It is true, indeed, that most, if not all the savage tribes that have yet been discovered, have some rude notions of a Supreme Being who made all things ; but no man can say how much this is the effect of traditionary communication, handed down from age to age. This tradition may have sprung originally from a divine revelation, the light of which was not suffered to be entirely extinguished among the heathen : and where it existed in the faintest degree, men would acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Being, and regard the works of creation as a proof of it, though they should not have been able by means of them to make the original discovery.

Be this as it may, I consider myself entitled to take advantage of the enlightened state of society with which it is my happiness to be connected, and within the sphere of which this controversy is carried on. No man can apply his mind to the study of astronomy, or any branch of natural science taught in our schools, without perceiving abundant demonstration of the existence of a Supreme Intelligence—a Being of infinite wisdom, goodness and power ; insomuch, that it is reasonably doubted whether there be such a creature as a speculative atheist in the kingdom. Now, I do not hesitate to affirm, that if any man will apply himself as honestly and sincerely to the study of the Scriptures, as scientific men apply themselves to the study of science, he will find the Bible demonstrate itself to be the word of God, as clearly as the solar system demonstrates itself to be the work of God. By honesty and sincerity in this connexion, I mean, that persons applying themselves to the study of the Bible be no more indisposed to the knowledge

which the Bible teaches, than they are to that which astronomy teaches:—in other words, that they be ready to give as cordial a reception to the truth in the one case, as in the other.

I am aware that such an honest, sincere, favourable disposition of mind towards what the Bible teaches, does not universally, or even generally, exist with men who are favourably enough disposed towards what natural science teaches. Creation presents the Divine Being in certain characters, or attributes: the Bible presents him under the very same characters, with the addition of certain others, which do not appear from the works of creation. Now, when the human mind comes into contact with those attributes which are exhibited in the Bible only, it feels such an opposition to its own state and character as to be hurt and offended; and, in thousands of instances, repelled from the study of a subject so disagreeable. It will be understood that I am speaking of the human mind as a *carnal mind*. How it became such is not the present question. I stop not here to show that it is so naturally. I claim only to have it admitted, which I think none will deny, that men in general are *practically* carnal; that is, they are sinners: and having this conceded, I plead the fact of a certain innate revolting of the human mind against those traits of the divine character which are discovered only in the Bible, as a proof that the Bible has proceeded from a pure and holy Being; from a Being whose character is the reverse of what we see to be the character of carnal men; that is, from God himself: and thus we come to know that the Bible is the word of God, from the circumstance of its being the very thing which, above all others, provokes the enmity of the carnal mind.

I grant that this is not an argument calculated to impress the mind of an untutored savage; and perhaps it may have little weight with our almost equally untutored Papists. But I consider myself as addressing wise men, who are able to judge of what I say. Suppose, then, I am in possession of a cabinet of the most curious workmanship; that I alone, as I suppose, am in possession of the key; that the wards of the lock are so complicated, that I can defy the world to open it; and that, in fact, it is found impossible to gain access to it without the real key:—I have not said or supposed from whom I received this cabinet, but merely supposed it in my possession. Suppose then, farther, that a stranger comes to me, with a key in his hand that opens it at once; and that he tells me that he received the key from the very person who made the cabinet and constructed the lock, I feel myself constrained to believe the testimony of this stranger; his report brings with it such evidence that no reasonable man can refuse to yield to it.

Now, without pursuing the figure farther, I affirm that this cabinet is my own heart. I defy the whole world to have access to it, or to know what is in it; but when I read the Bible, I find



it tells me what is in my heart. I know then, that He who made the cabinet made also the key : in other words, that the Author of my being is the Author of the Bible. The woman whom Christ met at the well in Samaria, argued upon the most philosophical and rational principles, when she said, " Come, see a man who told me all things that ever I did ; is not this the Christ ? " She had been reminded of certain events in her own history, which she believed no living creature knew ; hence, she was constrained to acknowledge the divine inspiration of the person who had honoured her with an interview. Upon the same principle, any man who will carefully apply his mind to the reading of the Scriptures, will find them a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. They will tell him what is in his heart, and thus prove themselves to be the word of God. If Mr. Andrews shall say, that this is nothing to him ; that it does not convince him that the Bible is the word of God ; I have only to reply, that his conviction is not the work which I undertook. The question was not how *he* might know, but how *I* know, the Bible to be the word of God. I have here told him a part, and I shall tell him more before I have done : and if he does not shut his eyes against the truth, he may know it as well as I.

Independently of the saving knowledge of the truth of divine revelation, which is the effect of a divine influence on the heart, and which can be produced by nothing short of this influence,—there are certain rational considerations which may, and ought to produce a rational conviction of the truth. On this subject, I gladly avail myself of a passage in the introduction to a pamphlet just published, by Thomas Erskine, Esq. Advocate, entitled, " Remarks on the Internal Evidence of the Truth of Revealed Religion." I have never met with any work that comprises, in so small a compass, so complete an answer to the question which I am attempting to answer ; namely, how we know the Bible to be the word of God. If any of my readers shall be induced, from this short recommendation, to procure and read the work, I am persuaded they will thank me for it. \* As a specimen of his mode of illustration, and as bearing directly upon the point in hand, I quote the following :

" When we are once convinced of the existence of a cause, and are acquainted with its ordinary mode of operation, we are prepared to give a certain degree of credit to a history of other effects attributed to it, provided we can trace the connexion between them. As an illustration of this, I shall suppose, that the steam-engine,

\* There is an excellent work by Dr. Owen on the same subject, entitled, " The Reason of Faith in the Holy Scriptures ; " of which an edition was published in Glasgow, in 1800. Like the other writings of that eminent divine—indeed, like most writings of his age—this work wants compression ; but it will richly repay the labour of a patient reading.

and the application of it to the movement of vessels, was known in China in the days of Archimedes; and that a foolish lying traveller had found his way from Sicily to China, and had there seen an exhibition of a steam-boat, and had been admitted to examine the mechanical apparatus of it,—and, upon his return home, had, among many palpable fables, related the true particulars of this exhibition; what feeling would this relation have probably excited in his audience? The fact itself was a strange one, and different in appearance from any thing with which they were acquainted: It was also associated with other stories that seemed to have falsehood stamped on the very face of them. What means, then, had the hearers of distinguishing the true from the false? Some of the rabble might probably give a stupid and wondering kind of credit to the whole; whilst the judicious but unscientific hearers would reject the whole. Now, supposing the relation had come to the ears of Archimedes, and that he had sent for the man, and interrogated him; and, from his unorderedly and unscientific, but accurate specification of boilers, and cylinders, and pipes, and furnaces, and wheels, had drawn out the mechanical theory of the steam-boat,—he might have told his friends, ‘The traveller may be a liar, but this is a truth. I have a stronger evidence for it than his testimony, or the testimony of any man: It is a truth in the nature of things. The effect which the man has described is the legitimate and certain result of the apparatus which he has described. If he has fabricated this account he must be a great philosopher. At all events, his narrative is founded on an unquestionable general truth.’” *Pages 2, 3.*

The application of this to the point in hand is extremely easy. Archimedes was a mathematician. He was acquainted with the operation, and could comprehend the result of certain mechanical powers. There were many things connected with mechanics which he did not know, for they were not discovered for ages after his time: but supposing them to have been discovered, and reported to him, he was in the knowledge of certain fundamental truths, which enabled him to decide, with infallible certainty, that certain causes put into operation, would produce certain effects: and supposing him to have received information of certain results which he had not thought of before, but demonstrably proceeding from established principles, he would believe the report, independently of the character of the medium through which it was conveyed to him. If the reporter were an honest man, he might, if he pleased, throw the weight of this into the scale of evidence; but it would add nothing to the fulness of his conviction.

Now, there are fundamental principles in morals and religion, believed by those who understand them, as firmly as any mathematical truth whatever. They are not demonstrated to the eye by

visible representations, but the impression of their truth upon the mind is as distinct as if they were. One of these principles is, that a pure and perfect system of legislation cannot proceed from an impure source. Suppose, then, a man as well acquainted with the law laid down in the Bible, and the whole procedure of the law-giver therein related, as Archimedes was with the mechanical powers, (and surely there are many men in the world of whom this may be predicated)—such a man would most undoubtedly conclude and declare, that this is a system that could not emanate from the father of lies: that being a system of perfect purity and equity, it must have proceeded from the Father of Lights, whose word it professes to be. Suppose he is told that this book was concealed for many ages by the Church of Rome; that now she has allowed it to see the light, because she has been compelled to do so; that she says we must believe its authenticity upon her bare word for we can have no higher authority for it; and that she has practised so many impositions upon the world, and told so many lies, that we ought to be cautious with regard to what she tells us, and look upon this book with some degree of jealousy;—suppose all these things to be objected against the Bible, the intelligent student of its contents would reply, I do not care a straw for what the Church of Rome may say either for or against this book; it proves itself to be of divine origin by its incomparable purity, sublimity, and harmony. It is, in short, the very thing that such a corrupt and impure body as the Church of Rome would wish to keep out of view, because it testified against her impurities: and the fact of her having concealed it until its publication was extorted from her, is an evidence that there is a divinity in it with which her carnality did not choose to come into visible contact.

After all, the knowledge of which I am speaking must be matter of individual consciousness. Every Christian must know experimentally that the Bible is the word of God, else he cannot enjoy the peace and comfort which it imparts to all who really know the truth. The sun in the heavens is known only by his own light; and He who made the sun is known only by his. The Holy Scriptures are that light by which alone God makes himself known as the Saviour of sinners; and by the illumination of his Spirit, he makes the light of his word as evident to the heart and conscience of them that believe, as the light of the sun is to them that see.

When a sinner becomes seriously concerned about his character, state, and prospects; and when, in such a state of mind, he reads the Bible he finds, at first, that it is all against him: by the holy law of God he is convicted and condemned; and he is conscious of a power and divinity in the word of condemnation, that makes him *feel* that it is the word of God. But the Holy Ghost, who has thus convinced him of sin, may be graciously pleased to con-



vince him also of righteousness ; that is, by the gospel, show him the way of salvation, which is fully made known in the Scriptures. The sinner so convinced will recognise this to be the word of God, for he perceives in it that which answers the demands of the law, which condemned him. There is a power also in this word that proves itself to be divine. It removes the sentence of condemnation : and he who was before under a fearful apprehension of suffering the punishment of his sins, sees now all his sins taken away by the sufferings of the divine Saviour, as related in the Holy Scriptures.

From this there arises a peace and joy in believing, of which no unbeliever can have any conception. It is a matter of individual consciousness. A Christian, under the broadest possible view of his own guilt, and with the fullest conviction that God hates sin with a perfect hatred, is yet enabled, under the influence of the gospel, to enjoy perfect peace even in the prospect of death, judgment, and eternity, because he knows that Christ hath made peace by the blood of his cross. This he enjoys as his own peace ; he has a personal individual interest in it. This is conveyed to his mind by the word of the gospel ; and this he knows to be the word of God, from the effect which it produces in him, and has upon him in the whole tenor of his life and conversation.

That must be of God which is the instrument of making men like God ; that is, which turns them from sin to holiness. Every sinner who has been so turned from his sins unto God, possesses a consciousness of the power of the word, which weighs more in his mind than a thousand arguments drawn from the external evidence of the truth of the Bible. His consciousness will not be held as sufficient evidence to others that the Bible is the word of God ; but if he was formerly a notoriously wicked person, and if he is now a sober and holy man, devoting his time and talents to the good of his fellow-creatures and the glory of God ; and if it is manifest that the change was produced by the Bible, every candid person who shall know the fact will be constrained to acknowledge, that truly the Bible is the word of God. I have put this case hypothetically, but there are many Christians alive whose history would demonstrate the fact that I mean to establish ; namely, that the Bible proves itself to be the word of God, by affording peace to the troubled conscience ; by teaching and enabling men to forsake a life of sin, and to live a holy life, and to rest in the full assurance of a blessed immortality.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXXV.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 10th, 1821.  
~~~~~

In my last Number but one, I gave a catalogue of what the "Catholic Vindicator" calls corruptions of the Bible by Protestant translators; which corruptions, however, do not appear to have been discovered by himself, as he gives them on the authority of Ward, who was just such a Catholic vindicator in the 17th century, as Andrews is in the 19th; with this difference, that the former seems to have had more learning than the latter. As a companion to this catalogue of Protestant corruptions, or mistranslations I shall insert here some curious information relative to the Popish mode of ascertaining the true meaning of passages of Scripture which have been differently translated. For this, I am indebted to a reverend gentleman of the established church in the sister island, who refers to a book which I have not seen.

"I spoke," says he, "of the *Bellum Papale*, by Dr. James, Bodleian librarian, a century back. If you can get the book, and his defence afterwards, they will give you much information on the state of the Scriptures after the Council of Trent. After the decree of that council, that the Vulgate edition was the only true, genuine, and canonical copy of the Scriptures, and that none other should be read or acknowledged by the faithful, Sixtus V. wished to publish an edition; but he found all the copies in such a state of corruption, that he declared them to be any thing but the Scriptures. He set at work with his learned men, cardinals, doctors, &c. &c.; revised and corrected every page, which was collated again and again, with all the most approved copies. He himself carefully examined every page, before it was printed; and afterwards, when the book was printed, he went over it, and, where there was an error, amended it by pasting words over words, and sentences over sentences. He then published it with a bull, declaring it, after a long preamble of all the pains and labours of doctors, &c, the only true and genuine Scriptures; and denouncing with the greater excommunication, any person who should dare to change the smallest particle, *minimissima particula*, not even to be absolved by the Pope. There was infallibility enough here to make light darkness, and darkness light; and this infallibility remained during

Gregory's, Urban's, and Innocent's reigns, for near three years, (short reigns they were,) until Clement VIII. was raised to the chair : but he being a Pope himself, was not afraid to take the bull by the horns, and turn it over to the Index Expurgatorius, where it was quite harmless ; for he boldly declared, in the face of the greater excommunication, that it was not *minimissima particula* (i. e. small matters) in which Sixtus' Bible was erroneous, but in 2000 principal errors, and innumerable smaller ones, which he would not mention, lest it should produce too much scandal ; he condemned it, and published the present Clementine edition. So much for the infallibility of the Popes ; for the preservative care of the Scriptures by the church that is the pillar and ground of truth ; and the purity of the only genuine copy of the word of God.

I shall finish my miscellaneous matter for the present, with the following letter from a correspondent in Ireland :—

#### TO THE PROTESTANT.

SIR,

Having lately read in your Paper, your just conclusions as to the effects which must follow the granting of promises of pardon and indulgences, by Popes and priests, to men, on the mere private acknowledgment of past crime, and a *promise* of future amendment, without any idea of that inward change of heart, producing heartfelt grief for, and real detestation of sin,—and those purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, inseparably connected with the Scripture promises of pardon, upon the footing of what Christ has done and suffered ;—and, as facts are the best proofs of positions, I shall state, from my own knowledge, some of those effects which are the result of such pretended remittance of sins. Living some years ago in a small town in the south of Ireland, and being intimately acquainted with the parish priest, and with others, both priests and laity, of the Roman Catholic communion, I could not be unacquainted with many of their practices, and their system of worship. As some of your English readers are not acquainted with many circumstances relative to the system of Popery in Ireland, it being more *unfettered* here than in England, I shall first give you some account of those things they call Stations for Confessing, and conclude with other miscellaneous matter.

It was formerly the custom, at whatever house these stations were held, to require that a dinner be provided for the priest : and as the host would not set the priest down by himself, it was always the practice to invite fifteen or twenty of the neighbouring farmers, and their wives, who were expected to attend at confession, and who would ask them in return. I have frequently seen purchased for these occasions, meat, several gallons of whisky, &c., and always a



bottle of wine for the *priest's own drinking*. This, you will say, was paying pretty well for the honour of his company: but this was not all; there was a tax of five shillings on the landlord for saying the mass, who was made to believe that a temporal and spiritual blessing would follow. Besides this, it was expected that each confessed person would pay something for absolution.—For causes best known to themselves, these dinner parties were, of late years, changed for breakfasts; which were more convenient for the priest, as he had to return home, when these stations were held in the country, perhaps some miles, and he might not so clearly see his way. Some simple people have said, that they were changed to do away those drunken revels which always followed these dinners; but this was not the case, as the following facts will show. I lived opposite to an industrious couple of the Romish religion, the man a cooper by trade, and his was one of those houses set down in the priest's book for a station (for the priests like to follow industry, hoping to partake more largely of those temporal blessings which may rationally be expected from it): I had, therefore, frequent opportunities of observing the effects of station confessions at this man's house. I have seen some of the company invited come out quite intoxicated; and on asking how they could get so beastly drunk, they stammered out that they were only at a station.

As the priest is seldom ready before twelve o'clock, these breakfasts usually commence about that time. The bill of fare is as follows: tea, a hot griddle-cake, butter, eggs, &c. &c., with *decan- ters of whisky*, placed on the breakfast-table: and as the Irish have a great affection for the *native*, as they call whisky, these decanters are frequently replenished, and the feast prolonged for the remainder of the day. It may be said that this is an unfair construction put upon the society of fifteen or twenty persons, invited to meet the priest at a station breakfast; that although some may outstep the limits of sobriety, the rest should not be charged with it; that these poor souls, for ought I knew, were, after pardon received from the priest, making pious resolutions of future amendment—laying down plans for moralizing their relatives and acquaintances—or devising how they may promote the moral and religious education of the rising generation, by the introduction of the Bible into schools, as the great and only fountain of divine revelation to man; showing him his lost estate both by nature and practice, and the necessity of coming to God for real pardon, peace, and holiness;—and that, at all events, surely their drinking bouts could not be fairly charged upon the priest. Whoever argues thus, does not know what Popery is. How sure its doctrines lead to licentiousness; how cruel and intolerant are its principles; and how much opposed to every effort to promote the moral and religious education of the poor children in its communion, I shall hereafter show.

ndeed, with them the proverb, that "Ignorance is the mother of devotion," is held as true, and more current, than any of the Proverbs of Solomon.

But to return to the subject of the stations—The writer was present at the settlement of an account with the spirit-dealer, for the whisky drank at but *one* breakfast station for confession, at his opposite neighbour's house, where the whole company, men, women, and children, could not have exceeded twenty-four persons ; when the bill, admitted to be correct and paid for, was seven half gallons of whisky, at 16s. per gallon ; a liquor considerably stronger than either brandy or rum. It may be objected, that this was too particular a case to be taken for a general rule ; and that the master of the house might be a very dissipated character himself, and have been too pressing with his guests. With regard to this man's general character, he passed among his neighbours for an industrious, sober man, in general : and as to his character with the priest, I assure you that both he and his wife were in several *holy orders*, as they are called in Ireland. So that taking this man's character, I am convinced that I take a standard much too high as an example of the good effects following confession stations ; for were I to select those stations which are held at publicans' houses, it would far exceed what I have detailed.

It is the practice for the priest to publish from the altar, at certain periods of the year—I believe before Christmas, and before Lent—that he will hold stations for confession at certain houses, then and there named. These houses are selected without previous liberty obtained from the owners, perhaps lest they may make objections, which many of them would most certainly do, if not thus publicly given out from the altar. The individuals thus selected make the necessary preparations (a general bill of the fare I have already presented to your readers) : and as it has been a prevailing opinion from the time of the Jews, that the publicans (formerly tax-gatherers) were the greatest sinners, and consequently required most mending, I have observed that they are more frequently selected : nay, I have observed that those who have most business are particularly selected by the priest ; it being reasonable to suppose, that the chief amongst the publicans must be chief amongst the sinners. As the liquor on these occasions is drawn from the cock, it is not so easy to calculate the expenditure ; but as they ask their best customers, it would be natural to believe that the landlord is not backward in recommending his liquor, nor his guests it: trying its strength, not having the usual reckoning to pay, and having previously quit scores with the priest.—As it may be alleged that the priest does not countenance these practices, I shall mention a fact. A female, invited to one of these confessional coteries, mentioned to some others how very polite the priest was at break-

fast to the women, pressing the bashful ones to take *whisky in their tea*. "Faith," says her husband, "it was very easy to prevail on them to take it, and for him to offer what was not out of his own pocket." The wife replied, "You dare not tell him so at your next confession."

Thus you may see, Sir, how much the moral principle is degraded by such a system, and even by the priests; a system which holds out to its deluded followers a yearly, or half-yearly, acquittal for sin. Well may that truth, applied by our Saviour to the Scribes and Pharisees, be applied to them: "Ye encompass sea and land to gain one proselyte; and when ye have gained him, ye make him twofold more a child of the devil."

That this system is equally opposed to every attempt to promote the moral and religious education of the poor children, I shall show by the following fact. A country gentleman of my acquaintance, of landed property, often deplored the wretched state of ignorance and wickedness in which his tenants' children were brought up; and more especially the profanation of the Lord's day, by every species of mischief, plundering orchards, breaking down young trees, gambling, dancing, drinking, &c.—conceived that some good might be done if these children could be brought into a Sunday school, and kept from idleness. Accordingly, he sent and received from the Hibernian Schools Society, sets of Moral Lessons for Children; he provided a house with two rooms; one for boys, the other for girls: and, at no inconsiderable expense, had every thing prepared for opening the school on the most *liberal* plan; and lest the *Bible* should give any offence, it was not to be introduced. Having thus prepared his plans, he desired his tenants to send their children there for two hours every Sunday morning, and the same in the evening. Sunday morning came, and about sixty of the finest open-faced children attended, all anxious to learn to read. Information of this soon reached the priest's ears. He immediately *cursed* from the altar every person who would presume to send a child to the school to be instructed by a heretic; and fearing this would not deter them, he declared he would not give the *rites of the church* to any person when dying, who would, after this injunction, attempt to send a child there. Thus was an establishment, calculated merely to convey moral instruction, with the knowledge of reading and spelling, broken up: and although the gentleman himself waited on the priest, and assured him there was not the least wish to proselyte a single child, requesting he would personally visit the school, and begging the co-operation of any of his flock who would attend,—the priest was inexorable, and told him, he could not consent that Protestants should interfere with the education of his people. I could adduce many more instances of the uncongenial nature of Popery, to every thing connected with



the improvement of the degraded condition of the poor in that community, in this kingdom. They act on right views of the subject, no doubt; because it is impossible that the Roman Catholics, as a body, could be so *priest-ridden*, if the scale of moral and intellectual improvement were advanced. Masses are so common in Ireland, that the price of them is very cheap, considering the advantages stated to be received from them. Now, a pious son of the church can get a *promise* from the priest of saying as many masses for the souls of his dear relatives in purgatory, as will bring them clear and clean out, at half-a-crown each mass: for it is laid down as an invariable rule, that to make a mass efficacious, it must be paid for. Indeed, the priests are willing to say masses over the *brute creation*; as in cases of murrain among cattle, the rot among sheep, and the measles, &c. among pigs. I dare say you will hardly credit this; but I assure you, I knew of masses being said over a *parcel of pigs* who had got some distemper!

Having alluded to the orders instituted amongst the Romish laity, I shall endeavour to give you some idea of them. From amongst the most devoted to the priest, and of those most frequent at masses, stations, &c., the priest selects a certain number of both sexes, who, on payment of certain fees, and the performance of certain ceremonies, are decorated with the badges of the particular orders they are initiated into: such as the Order of the Virgin, (one of the highest, if not the highest,) the Order of St. Bridget, of St. Francis, St. Benedict, &c. &c. These badges, or amulets, are worn inside, out of public view; and as they are first consecrated by the priest or bishop, the favourite devotee thinks him or herself placed under the immediate protection of that saint as a titular deity. These fraternities make a collection among themselves for particular masses, on these saints' days. I saw one of the rituals of one of these orders, which stated, "That as nothing in heaven or in earth was so meritorious in the sight of God as the celebration of the mass, in each of which the sacrifice of Christ is as truly and really performed as when he died on Calvary; and as the frequent repetition of the same was recommended and enjoined to all the faithful, it seemed good to the bishop to create and appoint a certain confraternity of holy brothers and sisters, in such a place, under the patronage of such a saint," &c. &c.: next followed the rules. These fraternities are not confined at all, or prevented from carrying on their trades and several callings. But although the above is stated to be the ostensible cause for forming these fraternities, yet there are private rules and instructions given to them, by which they are bound to be under the immediate direction, and in strict obedience to the priest; to inform him of every thing done in his parish, which affects himself or the Roman Catholic cause; and, in general, to be the *tale-bearers* of the parish. They

thus act as so many emissaries or spies, and are a great restraint on the people. Wo betide the person who dare speak disrespectfully of the priest, even if he should deserve it ; or who attempts to read the Bible, or to eat meat on a fish-day (but he may get drunk as often as he pleases, without any reprimand). The account is brought in triumph by one of these his emissaries, and the party accused immediately cited, and condemned to pay a fine, and undergo heavy penance ; which if he should refuse, he is threatened with *excommunication*, and the thunders of the church. I never knew an instance of resistance to such penance by the poorer sort, although I have amongst some few of the rich and more independent : and I have observed, that, in the latter cases, the priest did not follow up his threat.

But this is not all the service required from these confraternities. They are required to offer themselves to attend the sick Protestants, and the poorer classes particularly. If their services be received, they are directed to try every persuasive : first, by seeming compassion for their souls ; and, if that is not strong enough, then by promises of *temporal* assistance ; next, by endeavours to frighten them by frightful tales of apparitions, visions, &c. &c., of the damned spirits of Protestants, or the revelations of saints, particularly the Virgin. In the meanwhile, the priest's housekeeper is seen frequently calling to know how the patient is, and bringing tea, whey, &c. ; although, if the patient prove finally obstinate in refusing the priest's assistance, he may starve for him. The consequence is, as you may suppose, that, in many cases, they thus succeed, and then trumpet their success through the different parishes. Many other causes contribute to their success ; sometimes the want of a resident clergyman of the Church of England ; and the natural bias of the unregenerate mind to lean to Popery, on the opinion that good works, with a little assistance, will help them into heaven. The Papist even dares to tell them, that though men may live Protestants, they wish to die Papists. Thus, they sometimes prevail by assiduity, affected kindness, and constant application, with the poor dying patient, who often does not know the principles of the new religion he is introduced into, and when his strength, and often his faculties, are exhausted. I shall now give you one example out of many. A poor Protestant, in the above town, was dying ; his daughter having previously married a Papist, and turned to mass, exhorted, and pressed, and entreated him to have the priest sent for, but all to no purpose. His Bible was then taken from him, as that was supposed a hinderance. Next, his own daughter took the bed her poor dying father was lying on from under him, saying to him, that straw was good enough for a heretic to die on. Every attempt was made by some of the fraternity, brought in by the daughter, to cajole or frighten him into a

compliance, but all to no purpose. He begged a Protestant neighbour, who accidentally called to see him, to whom he related the above, (and who informed the writer,) to sit by him; the poor man saying, that he did not know what they might do to him before he died. This man sat beside him until he became speechless, and was in the agonies of death. He could bear the scene no longer. You may reasonably conclude he would now be allowed to die in peace; the Protestant neighbour at least thought so, and left him; but no! Papists are not so easily foiled. A messenger was now sent to the priest, who was waiting up at night to be called, to say that now the coast was clear. He comes and speaks to the man in the agonies of death, and asks him if he will die a good Catholic? No answer. He baptizes and anoints the man in this state; and, taking him by the hand, desires him to give a proof of his dying in the Catholic faith; and he calls out, O how he squeezes my hand! The fraternity publish this *conversion*, as they call it, with many things connected with it, which had no foundation in fact.

I said the religion of Papists was intolerant and cruel. The above specimen will confirm this sentiment: and this is only one instance out of many of the practices which Papists are convicted of. It was of no consequence what may be the feelings of the dying man under the above operation, or *whether he had any feeling at all*: dead men cannot tell tales; and therefore they may invent as many stories of conversion of Protestants as they please.

J. A.

The above presents Popery in a truly fiend-like character. Under the influence of this delusion, filial affection, and every other amiable affection of human nature, is set at defiance. No matter what the living or the dying may suffer, in body or in mind, if the cause of holy church be promoted, and if the priests can persuade people to believe their lie. A man who submits to have the consecrated oil applied to parts of his body by the hand of a priest, or whether he submit to it or not, if it be but applied, as in the above instance, is understood to die in the true faith, and the devil can have no power over him; whereas, without such anointing, he would be in danger,—nay, would certainly be lost. This will form the subject of the next, and some following Numbers.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXXVI.

---

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17th, 1821.

---

AT the beginning of my last Number, I gave an extract of a letter which I had received from a clergyman of the established church, in Ireland, relating to the miserably corrupted state of that edition of the Holy Scriptures, which the Council of Trent declared to be the only authentic and true version. The following is another extract from the same letter, which will serve to introduce the next general head of discussion.

“But the ceremony of anointing,” says my correspondent, “has done more mischief here than any other tenet, if I may except the claim of Peter, and of one church; for the epistle of James seems to make it so completely an ordinance of the church, that when it is read, and the words (chap. v. 14, 15,) put strongly to the consciences of dying Protestants, it has caused multitudes of them to send for a priest, fearing to die without the *benefit* of it. Were it to end here, it would not be a matter of much consequence, as an unbeliever may as well be deceived by that, as by the partaking of bread and wine, which is the *viaticum* of all the Protestants, who know not the truth as it is in Jesus. But the system among them is, when an ignorant dying Protestant is worked on by a Popish friend, and they are ever on the watch for such, and that a priest is sent for, if he finds the person under any alarm, and the conscience weak, after he has spoken for some time, he says, that he will not absolve, or administer the holy oil, unless not only the dying person is baptized into the church, but also the whole family; and this, too, often succeeds, and is the principal cause of the sad relapse to Popery, which has been so great within thirty years back, that more

than two-thirds of the lower orders of the southern Protestants have gone over to the Church of Rome." This short and interesting statement, by a native Irishman, and a minister of the established church, who knows his country well, and has travelled over a great part of it, might lead to many serious reflections; but I have used it only as an introduction to the subject of Extreme Unction, which the Church of Rome puts in the list of her sacraments; and by means of which, along with her other impositions, she deceives many souls to their destruction.

I shall, as usual, lay down the doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting this sacrament, in the very words of her own approved authors, including the canon of the Council of Trent.

*Quest.* "What," says Bishop Hay, "is the end and design of the sacrament of extreme unction?" *Ans.* The Council of Trent declares it in these words: 'Our most merciful Redeemer, who desired that his servants should at all times be provided with wholesome remedies against all the darts of their enemies, as in the other sacraments he gave Christians the greatest helps, to enable them to pass their lives in a Christian manner, and free from any grievous spiritual detriment, so he hath fortified the latter end of our life with the most powerful protection of the sacrament of extreme unction. For, though our adversary seeks, and seizes, during our whole life, every possible occasion of ruining our souls, yet there is no time wherein he more vehemently exerts all his strength and art to ruin us entirely, and destroy, if possible, our confidence in the mercy of God, than when he sees the last moment of life approaching.' *Sess. XIV. in doct. de Extr. Unct.* By this we see, that the intention of our blessed Saviour, in instituting this sacrament, is to be the means of fortifying our souls against all the violent attacks and snares of our spiritual enemies at our last moments, and to enable us to make a holy death, and secure a happy eternity.

"*Quest.* Does the devil attack souls with more violence than ordinary in their last moments?" *Ans.* He certainly does so, as this general council declares, and as experience itself assures us."

[The grave bishop does not say how *he* knew this by *experience*.]

"For though, at all times, he goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, 1 Pet. v. 8., yet he redoubles all his force, and all his art, when we come to our last moments, knowing that if he can gain us then, we will be his for ever; but if he lose us then, he loses us for ever; according to that of the Revelations, when St. John heard a loud voice, saying, 'Wo to the earth and to the sea, because the devil is come down to you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time,' Rev. xii. 12. When the soul is in her last agony, hovering betwixt time and eternity, and on the point of leaving the body, the devil then knows there is but a short time to stay, and therefore he

redoubles all his assaults against her ; for, as another scripture says, 'There are spirits that are created for vengeance, and in the time of destruction they will pour out their force,' Eccl-us. xxxix. 33. ; like a king, who, being at war with his enemies, when he comes to a decisive battle, on the event of which his crown depends, calls out all his army on that day, and exerts the utmost of his power in order to insure the victory. Now, when the poor soul comes to this last and dreadful battle, what can she do?—if left to herself, she will surely perish. This our blessed Saviour well knowing, was pleased, out of his infinite goodness, to institute the holy sacrament of extreme unction ; by which he purifies the soul, still more and more, from all the remains of sin that may be in her, and which would give the devil more power and advantage over her ; and he also raises her up above her own strength, endowing her with power from on high, to enable her to fight manfully against all the assaults of Satan, and come off with the victory.

" *Quest.* Is extreme unction, then, a true and real sacrament of the new law ? *Ans.* It is, and has all the three things necessary for that purpose.

" *Quest.* 4. What is the outward visible sign used in extreme unction ? *Ans.* It is the anointing the different organs of our senses with holy oil, blessed in a particular manner by the bishop for this purpose, accompanied by prayer.

" *Quest.* 5. What is the inward grace this brings to the soul ? *Ans.* Both the sanctifying grace of God, by which any stain of sin that may be in the soul is washed away, and forgiven ; and also the actual grace of God, by which the soul is fortified and strengthened to resist all the assaults of Satan in her last moments. It also sometimes brings health to the body, when Almighty God sees that to be expedient for the good of the soul.

" *Quest.* 6. How is this outward action a sign of inward grace ? *Ans.* The oil with which the sick person is anointed represents the grace of God, which is poured down into the soul ; and the prayer used at time of anointing, expresses the remission of sins thereby granted to the sick person ; for the prayer is this, 'By this holy unction, and his own most pious mercy, may the Almighty God forgive you whatever sins thou hast committed *by the sight*,' when the eyes are anointed ; *'by the hearing*,' when the ears are anointed ; and so of the other senses.

" *Quest.* 7. Where is the sacrament laid down in the Holy Scriptures ? *Ans.* It is explained at large, in all its parts, and commanded to be used by the holy apostle St. James, in these clear and express terms : 'Is any one sick among you ? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.' See here the outward action of the sacrament, *anointing with oil, accompanied with*



*prayer* ; the inward grace immediately follows, 'and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up ; and, if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him,' James v. 14. 'Our Lord shall raise him up' above his own strength, fortifying his soul with his assisting grace ; and, 'if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him,' by the sanctifying grace of God, which will wash and purify his soul from all the stains of sin that may remain in it, so that he may appear with joy before his Lord." *Sincere Christian Instructed*, Vol. II. Chap. xxv.

The next question and answer relate to the effects of this sacrament ; and then we have a repetition of the same things over and over again, under about half a dozen more questions and answers, in which the principal thing to be noted is, that this sacrament is to be administered by the priests of the church, and that this is a branch of the priestly office.

After reading the above exposition of the Romish doctrine, one of the first reflections which will occur to the intelligent reader, will be, what a strange idea must papists have of the state of a dying Christian ! The bishop may be allowed to speak mere harmless nonsense, when he adduces his own *living experience* to show what is the state of *dying* persons, and what are their peculiar sufferings and temptations ; but when he represents a dying Christian as assailed by all the power and craft of the devil ; when he, at the same time, represents the soul of such a one under a *female* character, enabled by power from on high to fight *manfully* against all the assaults of Satan ; and when it is made to appear that this power is imparted by means of the application of oil, blessed by a bishop, to the eyes, ears, nose, &c. of the dying person, the thing assumes too much of the ludicrous to admit of its being regarded as a divine ordinance, or even of having its absurdity seriously exposed.

A blind man will not talk long about colours, or a deaf man about music, until he make it appear that he knows little or nothing of what he is talking about. This remark will be found to apply to what Bishop Hay has written,—nay, to what the Council of Trent has decreed about the state and condition of a dying Christian. I do not profess, like Bishop Hay, to speak from experience on this subject ; but I know from the Holy Scriptures, that Christ does not leave his people, in their last moments, to fight with the devil in their own strength, or in the strength of consecrated oil, applied to different parts of their bodies by a mere creature like themselves. Those who believe in Christ—that is, those who are really Christians—are kept by the mighty power of God, through faith unto salvation. Their whole Christian life is a state of warfare against sin, and Satan, and the present evil world ; and although the contest does not finally terminate till death, there is no scrip-

tural reason to conclude that it is necessarily, or even usually, most severe at the approach of death. It will not be denied that many Christians have been filled with dismay when they contemplated the near approach of the last enemy; but it is certain that others have waited his approach with the utmost composure, and even with a degree of triumph which appeared strange to persons in good health. In the degree of peace and comfort which Christ is pleased to impart to his people in the hour of death, he dispenses to every one according to his own good pleasure; but one thing is certain, they shall all be conquerors, and more than conquerors, through him that hath loved them; and they shall be able to say, "Though I walk through the valley and shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me, and thy rod and staff they comfort me."

When a Christian comes to die, he is not entering upon a scene entirely new to him. From the hour of his first believing, he became dead to the world, and the things of the world. It became part of his daily exercise to realize, by familiar contemplation, his transition from this world to the next; and his every-day reflections, so far as he is enabled to live up to his new character and state, are reflections suitable to the last day and hour of his life. Committing the keeping of his soul to his Creator in well-doing, every day, he fears not that he will be left alone to fight with his enemy the devil, when he comes to his last day; and when that day does arrive, he feels not the want of any new operation or process to pass upon either his soul or his body, to prepare him for death. He stands complete in his Saviour's righteousness; and knowing in whom he has believed, he commits his soul to him, in the sure and certain hope of being found with him in peace when he shall appear to judge the world in righteousness.

But the Popish doctrine represents a dying Christian in a state quite new, and as unprovided for, as if it had been unexpected. The Council of Trent speaks of the powerful protection of the sacrament of extreme unction as necessary to fortify the latter end of our life; and it is to be used only when that period is understood to have arrived. Christ appointed no means of fortifying the soul at the end of life, but such as a Christian ought to make use of every day of his life, because he requires his people to consider every day as if it were their last: but the Church of Rome has a sacrament intended for the dying only, and which she applies for the salvation of persons, many of whom never thought of salvation before; who were living in sin, and who hope to be saved from its punishment by the virtue of this sacrament, which, like all the rest, is sold to them for money. In this article alone, though there was nothing else against her, the Church of Rome appears in a character so diabolical, as to point her out as the very Antichrist; the blasphemer of God, and the destroyer of the souls of men.

Christ gives his people the most ample assurance of his presence and protection in the most critical circumstances, which, no doubt, include those incident to our last moments. "Fear thou not; for I am with thee; be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee: yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burnt; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee." Isa. xli. 10., and xliii. 2. Thus he assures his people, that, in every trying hour, he will be with them, so that no plague shall befall them, or evil come near them. Christ took our nature, that, through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. Heb. ii. 14, 15. The Christian believing this, can say, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 56—58. Such are the views of death which a Christian learns to entertain according to the word of God; and every example which the Bible furnishes of the last hours of holy men, corresponds with this representation. But the Church of Rome represents the last hours of her Christians as invariably, if not necessarily, a period of the most dreadful alarm, and of the most severe conflict with the devil. When his strength is gone, and when just a-dying, the Papist has to encounter all the power and craft of the devil, raised to their highest degree of excitement; he must, in short, enter the lists with Satan, as if he were his equal in strength; and he is not taught to seek assistance from any higher power than a fellow-creature, with a phial of consecrated oil, which he believes to be sufficient to frighten the devil away from him. Every child who understands the terms must see, that the religion which teaches this is not Christianity, but a mere, and a very absurd, modification of heathenism.

According to the Popish doctrine, as laid down by Bishop Hay, when a Christian comes to die, it is still doubtful whether the devil shall have him or not. Whether he shall go to heaven or hell, must depend upon his being able to "fight manfully" against the devil, and that, too, when he is in the agonies of death; and this ability to fight manfully is made to depend upon his being previously anointed with the holy oil; this depends upon the intention of the bishop who consecrated the oil, and of the priest who applies it; and having gone round this circle, we arrive at the point to which every popish ceremony tends, namely, that the salvation of a Papist depends entirely on his priest. All that Christ did and suffered for the salvation of sinners, goes for nothing with a Papist, unless his



priest be allowed to have the honour of making it available. Thus, extreme unction is not a vain ceremony, or a mere absurdity, which, when it has excited a sufficient degree of ridicule, may be left to the peaceable enjoyment of those who are in love with it. It is in itself a real Antichrist. It occupies the place of Christ in the ministrations of Popish priests, and in the thoughts of dying Papists. Christ himself is the only ground of hope in the hour of death. He is as accessible at the last minute of the eleventh hour, as he is in the first hour ; and it is the duty of every Christian who may be called to attend the dying-bed of a sinner, to tell him of Christ as the almighty and the only Saviour, who is able to save unto the uttermost all that come to God by him : and this truth brought to his ears, *may* be so imprest upon his heart by the Holy Spirit, as to effect his conversion. I do not say it *shall* be so ; for, in general men are left to die as they have lived ; but I say, it *may* be so, because Christ has not instructed his servants to prescribe limits to the exercise of his mercy towards sinners in the present life. But the Popish doctrine of extreme unction leaves Christ quite out of the view of a dying sinner ; and the priest, and the anointing, are put in his place. Accordingly, when a Papist is supposed to be dying, his great, his only concern, is to have the priest, with his holy oil ; and to have this applied to all the members of his body, by means of which he may have committed sin ; and to the organs of sight and hearing, by which sin may have found its way into the heart. Here Christ is not thought of at all. The priest and the oil are the saviour in which he confides. He ventures his eternity upon a deception ; goes down to the grave with a lie in his right hand ; and, while he perishes, the guilt of his murder lies at the door of the church that deceived and ruined him.

Bishop Hay has ventured to quote one passage from the Bible, and another from the Apocrypha, to support his view of the state of the souls of Christians in their last moments. The former is Rev. xii. 12. : "Wo to the earth, and to the sea ; because the devil is come down to you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time." It did not suit the bishop's purpose to give the true meaning of the passage, and to show what the earth and the sea have to do with the state of an individual Christian at the hour of his death ; and, in general, it will be found, that when a Papist has recourse to the Bible, it is for the purpose of misapplying and abusing it. The words seem to refer to the great wrath of Satan, when he perceived the progress of the gospel among the nations of the world, which, through the influence of the truth, were about to throw off his yoke : and, no doubt, his wrath will be more manifest than ever, when the nations shall throw off the yoke which he has long bound about their necks, by the instrumentality of the Church of Rome. "Wo to the earth and to the sea ;" that

is, the kingdoms of the world, more particularly of Europe, when this shall happen ! for the devil will not likely quit the throne which he has occupied for many hundred years, without such a struggle as will shake all the kingdoms of the civilized world to their very foundations. The more I see or hear of the devil raging among the Papists ; that is, the more falsehoods I hear them propagating against the government that tolerates and protects them ; the more I hear them crying out, that they are objects of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people ; —the more convinced I am, that the devil has begun to suspect that his reign is drawing to a termination ; nay, I believe, he knows the fact ; and in his great wrath, he will, no doubt, muster all his forces for the contest. He will have all the Papists, and an innumerable host of infidels, and merely nominal Christians, on his side. These have all along been opposed to the spiritual kingdom of Christ in the world ; some of them have been more, others less conspicuous, in the ranks of opposition : but if it be so, as I suppose it is, that the reign of Antichrist—that is, the reign of the devil upon the earth—is now to be of short duration, the adversary will muster all his hosts for the battle ; then, “wo to the inhabitants of the earth, and of the sea !” for then shall be days of tribulation such as the nations of Europe have never yet experienced.

Real Christians would be apt to despond with such a prospect before them, and to fear that the church of Christ would perish in the conflict : and indeed she would, if HE were not in the midst of her, and if his almighty power were not pledged for her preservation ; but God is the refuge and the strength of his people. He will preserve them. He will disperse his enemies like chaff before the wind. He will consume the Man of sin with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of his coming. He will establish his reign over the whole earth, and make his church an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations.

I have been led into this short digression, by Bishop Hay’s absurd misapplication of a prophetic passage of the Revelation. In my next Number, I shall resume the subject of extreme unction.

As for the bishop’s quotation from the Apocrypha, “There are spirits that are created for vengeance,” &c., I do not profess to understand its meaning, or to know whether it has any meaning at all. I rather suspect that it has none : but whether it be so or not is of no importance, seeing the writer of the book called *Ecclesiasticus*, is no higher authority than Bishop Hay himself.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXXVII.

---

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24th, 1821.

---

IN my last Number, it was laid down upon the authority of the Council of Trent, as adduced and expounded by Bishop Hay, that a Christian in his last moments, is, more than at any other period of his life, exposed to the rage of the devil. It is the *Romish* Christian of whom the council and the bishop are speaking; and I more than suspect, that the worst thing the devil can do to such persons, in the hour of death, is to let them alone, and leave them to the priests, who will do his work more effectually than he could do by appearing in his own person. If it were true that the devil really made an assault upon dying persons; that he reminded them of their sins, and filled their minds with alarming apprehensions of the coming judgment; some of them might be led to think of the gospel which they had heard or read, and might even flee for refuge to the hope which it sets before them, and so they would be saved from the wrath to come. But the worst possible state of a dying sinner is to be without alarm; to think that he is at peace with God, when he is an enemy of God. There is delusion enough in the heart of every unregenerate man to think this of himself, if there have been nothing particularly atrocious in his conduct; but, as if it were not so, the Church of Rome steps forward with a pretended sacrament, called extreme unction, by which she professes to give peace to the conscience of the dying sinner; and thus, as I have said, she does the devil's work most effectually,—so that he has no occasion to come down with great wrath, as Bishop Hay would have us believe, as if it were to torment his subjects before the time, or engage in a personal contest with them.



It was the curse of the false prophets of old, that they healed the hurt of the Lord's people slightly ; that is, they applied as a medicine what could not cure their wound, but gave only a momentary relief. The Romish priests are in the same condemnation, under circumstances of more heinous wickedness ; for their pretended sacrament diverts the mind of a dying sinner from the only efficacious remedy ; and after teaching him to trust in a lie, they sell him, for money, perhaps an hour of peace, to be followed by an eternity of unspeakable misery.

It is time now to enter upon a serious examination of the arguments by which the Church of Rome maintains her dogma about extreme unction. It must be allowed, that there is something in the sound of the words of the apostle James that seems to give countenance to the Popish practice ; and hence it is, that, as a correspondent says in my last Number, ill-taught Protestants are easily imposed upon, and persuaded to submit, in their dying hours, to have themselves anointed, under a sort of half persuasion that the thing can do no harm, and *may* do them good. But we ought to remember, that it is not the sound of certain words, taken out of their connexion, by which we are to understand what the Holy Spirit says in the Scriptures. It is the meaning of the words, taking in the whole of what is said upon any particular subject, by which our faith and practice are to be regulated. The words, James v. 14, 15, are, in our translation, "Is any sick among you ? let him call for the elders of the church ; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord : and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up ; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Here we certainly have "sickness," and "sending for the elders," (or priests, as the Douay version has it). Here we have "praying over the sick person," and "anointing him with oil," and "saving him," and "raising him up," and "having his sins forgiven." Taking these expressions in this detached manner, the Church of Rome would seem to have more foundation for this sacrament, than for almost any other of her impositions : and yet, the arguments deduced from them have no more weight than that of a bacchanalian, who should plead for the lawfulness of getting drunk, from certain words in the prophecy of Jeremiah : "Drink ye, and be drunken ; and fall, and rise no more." Chap. xxv. 27. \*

Anointing with oil was a ceremony in common use among the Jews. It was divinely appointed to be applied to persons who

\* These words are really in the Bible, and certainly they have a strange sound when detached from the context ; but if any person will read the whole passage, he will see that the words have no relation to persons getting drunk, but to certain national judgments, by means of which, people should be so overwhelmed and stupified, as to resemble the state of drunken men.

were set apart for certain offices ; and the application of it was often, if not usually, followed by a miraculous change in the character and conduct of those to whom it was applied. It was after being anointed with oil by Samuel, that Saul manifested those new traits of character that gave rise to the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" It was after Jehu had received a similar anointing, that he displayed his zeal for the Lord of hosts ; though it does not appear that either his zeal, or Saul's prophesying, was really sanctified to the service of God in a spiritual manner. The sign, however, was a common one, by which a divine and miraculous influence upon the body, or the soul, or both, was pointed out. This appeared by what the apostles did, when Christ first sent them out to preach the gospel. He gave them power, on that occasion, over unclean spirits, to cast them out. He gave them power also to heal the sick. This was certainly a miraculous power : and we are assured, by the divine record, that it was connected with the anointing with oil. "They cast out many devils, and *anointed with oil* many that were sick, and healed them." Mark vi. 13. It does not appear very clearly to us, what connexion there was between the anointing and the healing, but it was enough for the time then being, if it had a signification calculated to make an impression upon the minds of the Jews, or to illustrate any part of their ritual.

The power of casting out devils, and healing the sick, and even raising the dead, was continued to the apostles after Christ had gone to heaven ; and there were others admitted to a participation of some, at least, of these powers. The apostles had not only received the heavenly unction themselves, but they had also the power of imparting the Holy Ghost to those on whom they laid their hands for that purpose. Persons thus endowed would become, by the choice of their brethren, elders of churches, just as those who were first chosen to the deacons' office are declared to have been men full of faith and of the Holy Ghost.

James addressed his epistle to Christians who were Jews by birth. It was inscribed to the twelve tribes which were scattered abroad : and he informs them that the divine influence with which persons of their nation had been favoured from the beginning, was still continued in the persons of men who were their overseers in the Lord, who were endowed with certain miraculous powers ; and that the exercise of these powers was accompanied by the ancient sign, that of anointing with oil. However unimportant this ceremony may appear to us, it would have great significance in the mind of a Jew, as reminding him of many important events in the history of his nation, and of the most distinguished persons who had belonged to it and especially as reminding him of the grand

promise, which had been the hope of his fathers, of the coming of Him who is called the Messiah, or the Anointed One.

The apostle James, addressing Christians and churches whose elders, overseers, or bishops, (for it makes no difference which word we use,) were the first fruits of the preaching of the apostles among their brethren according to the flesh, and who had received the extraordinary gift, or power, of working miracles,—exhorts his brethren to take the benefit of this extraordinary power while it was continued among them; just as he would have advised any Jew, in the time of Christ's personal ministry, if in sickness, to apply for healing to the Master, if he had access to him; or to the disciples, if he had not; for they, in their Master's name, "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them."

The *saving* of the sick, in the words of the apostle James, evidently means the *healing* of them, or the removing of their disease, whatever it might be; for it is immediately added, "The Lord shall raise him up," that is, from his sickness. Here, then, it appears, that the thing prescribed by the apostle was essentially different from the Popish sacrament of extreme unction. This is never administered but to persons supposed to be at the point of death. It is not intended for healing them, or raising them up to health, but to enable them to go down to the grave fighting manfully with the devil.

If there were powers and privileges belonging to the primitive churches, while under the oversight of men endowed with miraculous gifts, I am inclined to think there were also diseases connected with that state, which were inflicted as a visible testimony of divine displeasure against certain transgressors. The church in Corinth had sinned grievously in their abuse of the Lord's supper; and, "*for this cause,*" says Paul, "many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." 1 Ep. xi. 30. These words, I think, throw some light on those of James. He speaks of sickness, in connexion with having committed sins; and of healing, in connexion with having sins forgiven. Now, we know, that when Christ cured men's bodies, he usually pardoned their sins too; and the words of the apostle James establish the same connexion; which seems clearly to intimate, that the anointing and the healing, where the former was practised and the latter effected, were a fulfilment of what Christ promised to his apostles when he was about to leave them. Mark xvi. 17, 18, "These signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall *lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.*" Here Christ does not say to his apostles, *you shall do so and so*, as if they were to have ex-



clusively, the privileges mentioned. He speaks of them that should believe their testimony ; *they* shall cast out devils ; *they* shall speak with new tongues ; *they* shall take up serpents ; *they* shall not be hurt by any deadly thing that they may drink ; *they* shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. All these things belonged to the state of the church, while under the oversight of men miraculously endowed : and such were the elders of whom James speaks, in the passage on which the Church of Rome builds her sacrament of extreme unction. If I shall be asked to show why the priests of the church have not now the same powers, I shall, in reply, ask them to show me if they can cast out devils, and handle serpents, and drink poison without being hurt by it, and heal the sick by laying their hands on them. If they can do these things, then they may practise the sign of anointing, with which they were connected ; if they cannot perform the things, they had better let the sign alone.

Here the trickery of the priests appears in a very striking light. They know that the cure of men's bodies is a thing that men can judge of. This, therefore, they do not pretend to do by their sacrament, though it is the very thing to which the anointing of the apostle James refers ; but no man can see whether or not their anointing produces any effect upon the soul ; this, therefore, is that which they say is done. It takes away the stain of sin from the soul, and fortifies it with divine grace ; which cannot be an object of sense, therefore the priests are secure from detection. If it should at any time procure bodily health, it is only by accident : and as the priest does not promise this, he is not liable to have his power called in question. But let us hear what Bishop Hay says on this subject. After explaining seven different things which are effected by extreme unction, he proceeds :—

“ *Quest.* Are all these effects certainly produced by the grace of this sacrament ? *Ans.* All those which regard the soul never fail to be produced by the grace of this sacrament, unless the sick person put a hinderance to them by his indisposition ; for the Scripture expressly affirms, that when it is administered, ‘ Our Lord shall raise him up, and his sins shall be forgiven him.’ So that God, who is faithful to his word, will never fail, on his part, to bestow these graces on the sick person, if he be properly disposed to receive them ; and the more perfectly he is disposed, the more abundant portion he will receive of them. But what regards the health of the body is not always granted, being only an accidental effect, and not essential to the sacrament, and is only given when the good of the soul requires it.”

Thus, it seems the virtue of this sacrament depends entirely upon the disposition of the person to whom it is administered ; and the degree of the benefit is according to the perfection of the

disposition of the dying person. I grant, that even a divine ordinance will not benefit a man who is indisposed to it : but if extreme unction could be of any use at all, it ought to be without regard to disposition ; for persons in the agonies of death are in general incapable of disposing their minds one way or another, or of being certain how, or in what degree, they are disposed ; so that though this sacrament is declared never to fail in its effects upon the soul, with but one exception, no man can be sure that the exception does not apply to him. “ The grace of this sacrament,” therefore, turns out to be no grace at all. It gives no security to any dying person that *he* shall be saved ; so the priests and their holy oil are the most miserable of all comforters. Nothing can give true peace to the soul, in life or in death, but a believing view of the death of Christ, by which the sting of death is taken away : and every thing that tends to divert the mind from this point is of the devil, though it should be an attempt to define too minutely what is meant by a *believing view* of Christ’s death ; \* by perplexing themselves about which, men may have their minds diverted from Christ himself, as much as by the imposing rite of anointing with holy oil, by priestly hands.

The following extract will show still more distinctly, what a broken reed Papists have to depend upon, when they put their trust in this sacrament. It is, in fact, of no avail without another sacrament which must go before it, except in certain excepted cases, which must be extremely perplexing to a dying person, if he is able to attend to the subject at all. The fourth of the seven effects of extreme unction, is expressed by Bishop Hay as follows : “ It also cleanses the soul even from the guilt of mortal sin, *in certain circumstances*, where the sick person cannot have recourse to the sacrament of penance ; for, where this sacrament of penance *can be had*, it must *always be applied to*, for the remission of mortal sin ; but in dying persons, it may sometimes happen that this can-

\* It is unquestionably of great importance to think and speak correctly about believing in Christ, as well as upon every other religious subject ; but I have seen persons, both in health and in sickness, who seemed to have more anxiety about *believing rightly*, than about believing the *right thing*. But unless Christ, and him crucified, be the chief, I had almost said the exclusive object of contemplation, we shall derive little benefit from analyzing the exercise of our own minds with regard to him. I do not say that this is unnecessary or unimportant ; but it ought to be secondary and subordinate. The mind that is exercised chiefly about Christ, will come to understand the nature of its own exercise ; but the mind that is exercised chiefly about its own operations, may never come to the knowledge of Christ ; and in this way, Satan may deceive souls to their ruin. A man may have his eyes open towards the most beautiful object in nature, but he will derive no pleasure from it ; nay, perhaps he will not really see it, if he is thinking only of the faculty of vision. So it is possible to fail of believing in Christ, while thinking and disputing about the nature of believing

not be done. As, for example, if their mortal sins were not forgiven in confession, for want of proper dispositions, though unknown to the person himself; or were committed after being at the sacrament of penance, but had quite escaped his memory; or, if being suddenly deprived of his senses, he could not confess them, but had a sincere sorrow for them. In these, or such like cases, even the guilt of mortal sins will be cleansed from the soul, by the grace of extreme unction." Here are so many *ifs* and *buts*, to use a vulgar expression, that no man can be certain what benefit he will derive from this sacrament, or even from that of penance, or whether he will derive any benefit at all from one or both of them. One is apt to conclude from this, that what has been called in Scotland the "glorious uncertainty of the law," has been transferred to the Popish gospel: for, as the priests are the sole expounders of this gospel, which, in their phraseology, is called "the new law," they are able to extort immense sums of money from dying persons, and their friends, in order to obtain a favourable interpretation of all the doubtful points, which can easily be made to apply to the case of any man that ever lived or died. I request my readers to view Popery in the light of extreme unction alone, as thus expounded by a late Scottish bishop, and let them say, if it does not exhibit a system of opposition to the gospel of Jesus Christ, as prominent and mischievous as Antichrist can possibly be.

I shall conclude this subject, by showing that this pretended sacrament is a mere novelty of the dark ages, and that it was entirely unknown to the Christians of the earlier ages. I have already shown, that the words of the apostle James relate to the healing of the sick, or their restoration to health; and that, therefore, they furnish no authority for anointing the dying, solely with a view to their death. We read of many instances of persons being anointed, while in sickness, during the first four or five centuries; but all these instances seem to have been connected with the hope of restoration to health; and there is reason to think that the practice was superstitiously continued, after the miraculous power of healing had ceased: but as a sacrament, to be administered to the dying for their spiritual benefit, we read nothing of it for the first thousand years of the Christian era. There is not the least mention of it in Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, or Cyprian, or any of the writers of the first three centuries, who yet discourse frequently and plainly of the discipline and sacraments of the church; and therefore it was not known to them. Neither was it known to the fourth century, which afforded so many Christian writers, since not one of them mentions it, not even when writing of the sacraments and rites of the church. Epiphanius treats largely of the doctrine, and discipline, and rites of the church, in his work against heresies, but not a word of extreme unction. The counterfeit Dionysius, in his



Ecclesiastical History, lays down, with wonderful particularity, all the mysteries of the church, from the baptism to the burial of the faithful ; but of extreme unction he is altogether silent. And so is the author of " Apostolical Institutions," in his eighth book, in which he undertakes to declare all ecclesiastical forms whatever.

The literature of the first six centuries consists, in a great measure of narratives of the life and death of many extraordinary persons and eminent saints ; yet there is not the least intimation that any one of them underwent the process of extreme unction. I have before me above a score of names of great persons, whose biography is furnished, with less or more minuteness, by Eusebius ; but not one of them is said to have been favoured with this sacrament. St. Augustin writes many things of his excellent mother, Monica, but nothing of her being anointed ; and the biographer of St. Augustin himself, is equally silent with regard to him.

Now, this seems extremely strange and unaccountable, had such a sacrament been then known in the church ; especially when we consider that, in later ages, the writers of the lives of the saints seldom *omit* the circumstance ; but usually give it as a prominent part of their history, that they had received anointing of the holy oil. I have before me, also a list of great men of whom this is recorded, among whom I observe the angelic doctor St. Thomas Aquinas, and the no less famous St. Dominic, founder of the Inquisition, and of the order that bears his name. No other reasonable account can be given why this, so very material a circumstance, should be perpetually omitted in describing the deaths of the ancient Christians, and hardly ever omitted by Roman writers of later times, —but that as the thing itself is now constantly practised in the Church of Rome, so it was utterly unknown to the ancient church.

From the fifth to the ninth century, the biographers of distinguished persons very frequently mention their receiving the eucharist, never that they received extreme unction, before their departure out of this life ; which is proved by many instances out of Bede and Surius. But had extreme unction been used in those times, no reason can be given why the mention of this should be perpetually omitted, which is surely as worthy of being remembered as the other. See these things more in detail, and an immense mass of matter on the subject in general, in the Preservative against Popery, folio, Vol. II. Tit. vii. pp. 72—101.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXXXVIII.

---

SATURDAY, MARCH 3d, 1821.

---

HAVING despatched the subject of extreme unction, I should now proceed to the next general head of discussion, which falls to be the history and character of the Jesuits. Here I could find matter enough to fill some volumes; but I shall, as usual, endeavour to compress it, as far as is consistent with giving a fair view of the subject: and, before entering seriously upon it, I shall introduce some miscellaneous matter connected with it.

In the following extract of a letter from a gentleman in England, to his friend in Ireland, both THE PROTESTANT and the Jesuits are introduced. I do not know the name of either the writer or the *writee*, (if I may be allowed to coin a word, which will be understood by my mercantile readers, as well as those in the law profession,) but the extract was forwarded by a person of the first respectability in Ireland, to a gentleman of this city, with a request that it should be communicated to THE PROTESTANT. I am perfectly satisfied with the negative praise of being *no bad* reasoner; but I am mortified to think that there are Popish champions for whom I am “far from being a match;” I mean, with the word of God in my hand; for I have no other weapon, and I confess myself to be nothing without it. The extract is as follows:

“The writer of THE PROTESTANT is a clear-sighted, energetic penman, and no bad reasoner; but I assure you, my dear Robert, he is far from being a match for the Popish theologians who have lately thrown down the gauntlet, such as Berrington, Thake, Lingard, &c. &c.: to remove the impressions likely to be made on the more reflecting part of the community, by such writers as these, would require the talents and erudition of a Sankey or a Magee; and, in my opinion, no time should be lost. It is now, I believe, five years since Berrington and Thake published their joint work, entitled, ‘The Faith of Catholics supported by Scripture, and by the writings of the Fathers of the Greek and Latin Churches, during the first five centuries,’—and yet no Protestant divine has attempted to answer it. The Roman Catholics have increased in this country (England) within the last thirty-six years, especially since the establishment of the Jesuits at Stoneyhurst. They are very numerous in Scotland; and, I may say, multitudinous in the districts of London and Lancashire: especially the latter, where the

Jesuits are most favourably received. They are likewise to be found in considerable numbers in Yorkshire, Wiltshire, Warwickshire, and Staffordshire. About thirty years ago, they were found, by actual computation, to amount to 69,376 ; they are now computed, by their own writers, to amount to about 500,000 : \* and I feel persuaded, that this number will be doubled in a very few years. Indeed, I think no person can entertain a contrary opinion, but one who is totally incapable of foreseeing the effects naturally producible by the various existing circumstances, calculated to promote this increase. Their colleges, schools, &c. have been increased from three to fifty ; and their chapels from a small number to nine hundred : their clergy are exceedingly numerous—many of them supported by old rent-charges on the estates of noblemen—have small congregations, and, consequently, much leisure, which they never fail to turn to account in the way of making proselytes, either by writing or conversation. The rural people of England, of the lower order, when not under the superintendence of evangelical clergymen, are easily entrapped by artful Jesuits : witness the almost incredibly numerous conversions in Lancashire ; many of the higher orders, as was lately intimated to me by a most sensible and pious person who knows them well, are not indisposed to the religion of the Church of Rome. The Jesuits have several newspapers, and many periodical publications, either partially or wholly under their control. Their affectedly liberal sentiments ; their professedly exclusive hatred of dissenters, methodists, &c. ; their insinuating, affable, conciliatory, submissive conduct ; their decorous manners, conviviality, and diversified learning,—have given them a footing in almost every society where true religion does not predominate, and quieted the apprehensions of thousands. When all this is considered, and when it is recollected that no Protestant converted to Popery can ever after be reclaimed—being either persuasively or authoritatively restrained from perusing such controversial works as might tend to refute the sophistry by which he was ensnared—is there not abundant reason for apprehending, that the growth of Popery here will be, at least, as rapid as I have said, if not much more so ; is it not then the duty, the bounden duty, of every true follower of Christ, not only to deprecate, but to endeavour to become instrumental in preventing its growth ? Vital Christianity and Popery are naturally repulsive ; they never can be amalgamated ; they are essentially incompatible ; they are as opposite as the poles. The latter, supported as it has been by the

\* This is the number estimated by the Papists themselves ; and their propensity to overrate their strength is well known. The writer, in part of a sentence which I have omitted, gives it as his opinion, that they are much more numerous ; in which, however, I think he must be mistaken : and the reason why I do not insert his own words, is, that I do not choose to give currency to a statement which I consider greatly exaggerated. Prot.



utmost exertions of human ingenuity, and, indeed, peculiarly captivating to all whose minds are not preoccupied and impressed by the word of God, presents an almost insuperable barrier to the extension of the pure religion of Jesus. Inveterate heathenism may be overcome by vital Christianity : this, I trust, we shall soon, with the divine blessing, see proved in Hindostan. Philosophical infidelity may be overcome by it : this was proved during the three first centuries, at Athens, Alexandria, and Rome ; and has been farther proved, in individual instances, in our days.

“ But what has been the progress of vital Christianity, in opposition to Popery, throughout Europe, since the establishment of Loyola’s fraternity in the sixteenth century ? There have not been wanting, in every country, intrepid followers of the Lord Jesus, ready to address their Popish opponents in the words of St. Paul to the sorcerer Elymas—“ Oh, full of all subtlety,” &c. “ will you not cease to pervert,” &c. : but how far have they been instrumental in bringing from darkness to light ? Vital Christianity, thanks be to God, begins to dawn on the Popish states of Germany ; but see how the clouds of Popery are thickening around it, by the never-ceasing wind that blows from the Vatican. It once slightly dawned in Spain and Portugal, but it has long since been invisible there. Unassisted man may despair of rendering vital Christianity triumphant over the idolatry and other abominations of Popery ; but my Bible inclines me to cherish a persuasion, that man will not much longer be unassisted in the glorious work ; the arm of the Lord seems to be actually abroad ; and it is the duty of his people to seize the present opportunity to fight in his cause. Papal darkness is fast overspreading the land ; but as, in the natural world, darkness is the harbinger of light, so the darkness I have been lamenting may soon be succeeded, and, I believe, will be succeeded, by an unprecedented blaze of light.”

Every Christian will readily say Amen to these highly important remarks, and truly Christian anticipations. I feel myself at one with this writer, in almost every thing that he has said ; and I should be much obliged to him if he would inform me where I may find these wonderful champions of Popery, who cannot be successfully opposed but by men of such talents as Magee, who is well known to be one of the first literary characters of the age. One who does not pretend to much learning, beyond what a mercantile education furnishes, might reasonably be excused from entering the lists with authors, with whom none but such literary and controversial giants as the Bishop of Raphoe are worthy to contend ; yet, if any one will tell me where Berrington, and Thake, and Lingard, are to be found, I shall be glad to try a hand with them. I do not mean to set out a Quixotting, to break a lance upon their skulls, or to have one broken upon mine ; but if any person will send me, or tell me where I may procure their books, I shall try their strength. I have

read, or heard somewhere, of the name of Lingard ; but Berrington and Thake never met my eye or my ear before. I have read and heard much of the great and “ unanswerable Milner, than whom a more firm and orthodox divine never breathed,” according to Mr. Andrews, and I have found no difficulty in answering some of his sophisms and blasphemies ; so that I should have no apprehension of a defeat when contending with meaner men.

The remissness of our Protestant divines is truly deplorable, if they have suffered such a work as the above writer mentions, to remain five years without attempting to answer it ; especially if it be so formidable as it is represented. As I am not what the schoolmen would call a “ theologian,” it is not to be expected that I should be able to grapple with such a work in true theological style ; but taking a plain common-sense view of the matter, I venture to undertake the refutation of it before seeing it. It contains the principle of its own destruction in its very title : “ The Faith of Catholics *supported* by Scripture, *and* by the writings of the Fathers of the Greek and Latin Churches, during the five first centuries.” An arch that rests one end upon a rock, and the other upon sand, will be swept away by the first flood that assails it, as completely as if the foundation had been sand at both extremities ; and so shall the system of religion that is built partly on divine, and partly on human authority. The boasted system of Berrington and Thake is *supported* equally by Scripture and by human writings. Such a system the Head of the church disclaims altogether. It cannot be His religion ; for he commands his disciples to call no man on earth master ; that is, to acknowledge no authority but his own in matters of faith and worship. “ The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver ;” and whatever He is to his people, he is that exclusively. He admits no partnership in authority, any more than in worship : and the very attempt to associate the writings of men with the word of God, in support of a religious system, is such a disparagement to the divine word, as is equal to a rejection of it. Thus, I convict the system of Berrington and Thake of opposition to the religion of Christ, from the very title of their book ; and if I shall have the good fortune to procure the book itself, I have no doubt I shall be able to confirm the verdict, by a hundred instances of opposition to the doctrine of the Bible. I shall confine myself to writers of the first century, leaving all the rest of the five to them ; though, by their mode of expression, it may not be easy to say which of the five should have the precedence, seeing they are all *first* centuries ; and they may urge a claim for precedence on behalf of any one of the five that suits them best. To put the matter, therefore, beyond a doubt, I shall keep by the apostles, and leave the whole host of the fathers to them.

I suspect that there are many of the lower, as well as of the

"higher orders," in England, who "are not indisposed to the religion of the Church of Rome;" because it is a system which supplies, by a few ceremonies, the place of that change of heart, and reformation of life, which are essential to true Christianity, but to which men in love with sin are ever indisposed. The religion that encourages men to continue in sin, from a persuasion that they can obtain absolution from a priest, for a few shillings, commends itself to wicked men of all ranks; and it wants nothing but general respectability and popularity, to make it very generally embraced. I lately expressed my opinion, that the reign of Antichrist was drawing towards its termination; but this is perfectly consistent with the fact, that Popery is greatly on the increase. It may even obtain a temporary re-establishment in Protestant countries; but this will only be giving the Man of Sin a momentary elevation, that he may fall with the greater violence, like a great millstone cast into the sea by the hand of a mighty angel.

From the above extract, we see what the Jesuits in England are doing. They are proceeding like their master, "with all subtlety." To the high churchman they profess, what, I believe, they really feel, great abhorrence of dissenters: and to the dissenters they use soft words and fair speeches, calling them "our dissenting brethren," with a view to bespeak their aid in obtaining what they call "Catholic emancipation;" giving them reason to hope, that when they have got into Parliament, they will procure the same benefit to dissenters in general. And, strange as it may seem, there are some birds so simple as to be caught by this chaff; as appears by a petition to the House of Commons, by some independent dissenters in the west of England; who humbly entreat the "honourable house to take into consideration the claims of our Catholic brethren for universal emancipation, and to extend to *them* those rights and immunities to which they are justly entitled, as a loyal and pious portion of the British empire." Thus, having asked for the Papists that "to which they are *justly entitled*," the petitioners modestly, and as if it were a secondary matter, entreat, of the "candour and *bounty* of the house, the extension of civil immunities, and political honours, to all the subjects of the crown of Great Britain, without respect to their religious opinions." In plain English, these Independent Protestant dissenters demand for Papists as a *right*, what they themselves are willing to receive as a matter of *bounty*; \* and it is a bounty that they shall never receive from a Parliament containing Popish members. These would

\* Perhaps justice to the parties requires that I should give the petition entire. I shall, therefore, bring it in here. It is, besides, a document worth preserving in such a work as *THE PROTESTANT*. It is introduced in the *Orthodox Journal* for July last, by the editor, in the following manner: "We copy, with sincere satisfaction, the following petition of the dissenters of Cockermouth, in favour of civil and religious liberty."



kick away the ladder that raised them to place ; they would throw their whole weight into the scale of any intolerant party that does, or may hereafter, exist in the established church, and the severities of Bonnar and Laud would be acted over again. This our dissenters would find out when too late to help themselves ; as would

*" The humble Petition of the undersigned Protestant Dissenters, of the Independent denomination, residing in the Town and Neighbourhood of the Borough of Cockermouth,*

" SHEWETH,—That, with confidence, relying on the justice and liberality of the British senate, your petitioners beg leave humbly to lay before your honourable house the unmerited stigma which has long been impressed on a body of subjects, whose loyalty and fidelity have yet been constantly demonstrated. That, in the imposition of civil disabilities upon account of religious opinions, your petitioners deprecate an infringement of the primary law of mental freedom ; the right of each to worship God according to the unbiassed dictates of his conscience. That, considered apart from the great law of native freedom, the present restriction of the Catholic Christians is evidently injurious to the best interests of the country, by the partial exclusion of men of integrity from offices of state ; and by causing dissensions and invidious distinctions between the several denominations of religious creeds in the British empire, at a time when the prevalence and triumph of deism and infidelity demand the united energies of all persuasions in the defence of truth. Nor can the limitation of religious liberty be defended on the ground of policy, since loyalty and attachment to the constitution of the land were declared, on inquiry, by the Catholic universities of Louvaine, Douay, Alcala, Salamanca, Valadolid, and the Sorbonne, to be incumbent on those who profess the communion of Rome : and the antiquated absurdity of their keeping no faith with heretics, has been positively and indignantly disavowed by the college of cardinals *de propaganda*, under the immediate sanction of Pope Pius VI. ; as well as by Catholics of the united kingdom.

" That your petitioners should consider themselves unworthy the names of Protestants and dissenters, could they for one moment deny to Anglicians and Romanists, that sacred liberty which they hold to be the birth-right of man, and for which our fathers suffered by the prison, the axe, and the faggot !

" That your petitioners, therefore, beg leave humbly to entreat your honourable house to take into consideration the claims of our Catholic brethren for universal emancipation, and to extend to them those rights and immunities to which they are justly entitled, as a loyal and pious portion of the British empire ; and thereby to conciliate the affections of a large proportion of his Majesty's subjects, in these portentous times of political ferment.

" That while your petitioners pray your honourable house to grant that liberty to the Church of Rome which is the right of Englishmen, the distinction which severs the Protestant dissenters from the great body of the people, cannot but excite them to entreat, of your candour and bounty, the extension of civil immunities, and political honours, to all the subjects of the Crown of Great Britain, without respect to their religious opinions—since a loyal and constitutional disposition has ever been characteristic of those men, to whom the historian \* attributes the preservation of that liberty, which should ever be dear to the freemen of Britain !"

There is so much in the style and manner of the above that resembles the writings of Papists, that I suspected it to be a piece of Jesuit manufacture ; in which, however, I did them injustice for once ; for on application, by

\* Hume. Vide Hist. of Eng. V. p. 190—8vo. 1763.

also certain leading men in our Scotch establishment, who at present cannot understand why we should apprehend any danger to arise from granting to Papists all that they demand.

But to return to the English Jesuits: they become literally all things to all men, that they may gain some. They can be grave with the serious, and lively with the gay; pray with the pious, and scoff with the profane; they can fast with the abstemious, and drink with the drunken: not that they themselves are in the habit of getting drunk, like the priests of meaner order in Ireland and elsewhere. The Jesuits are too good politicians to let themselves down to the derision of the people by such beastly manners; but they know how to indulge persons, whom they are striving to gain, in all manner of conviviality, though it should reach to the greatest degree of excess. They will modestly hint that such things are not right, but they know all the excuses that good-fellowship suggests; they will allow them all the weight to which they are entitled; they will make the most ample allowance for time, and company, and circumstances; insomuch, that no man shall need to feel much anxiety on account of his irregularities, seeing the priest connives at them; and, at any rate, can grant absolution when it is necessary. Thus, the Jesuits are most pleasant companions; and Popery is

letter, to a gentleman in Cockermonth, I had the mortification to learn that it was a *bona fide* petition of the persons whose designation it bears. The gentleman to whom I wrote, handed my letter to the gentleman who was the author, and had been the chief promoter of the petition; and from him I received a polite and prompt reply, acknowledging and justifying the procedure on the ground of its being a petition for "universal emancipation," not that of Catholics only. But it does not appear to have been so understood by Mr. Curwen, who presented it to the House. In his letter, acknowledging receipt of it, he says, "The truly Christian and enlightened sentiments your petition expresses, accord with what I have ever felt upon the subject. *Mr. Grattan's motion shall have my cordial support.*" Now, Mr. Grattan's motion was not for "universal emancipation," but for that of *Papists only*: and suppose Papists were as harmless, and loyal, and pious, as the Independents themselves, to give them precedence and priority in admission to places of power and trust, would be making an unjust and invidious distinction, to which no one sect is entitled more than another, and certainly Papists least of all, from their well known hostility, not merely to another faith than their own, but to the *persons* of those who refuse to embrace their errors, and practise their idolatries and superstitions.

Candour requires me to express my conviction, that the Independents in Cockermonth, in honest simplicity, make use of the language furnished for them by Popish writers, about the declaration and disavowal of the "Catholic universities," and of "the college of cardinals *de propaganda*," but if they were as well acquainted with Popery as their fathers of the 17th century were, they would use very different language; and they would, perhaps, not even desire political power for themselves, if it was to be at the dreadful risk of having Papists brought into power along with them. The wolf may tell the sheep that he has laid aside his claws and his teeth, or that he never had any; and that, therefore, they may safely break down the fence and let him into their fold; but they would be silly sheep, indeed, that would believe his fair speeches, and comply with his request.

the most delightful religion in the world : no wonder that men of pleasure, of all ranks, should be ready to fall into it.

A correspondent has favoured me with a long letter on the character and principles of the Jesuits, from which I give only the following extract, as I cannot afford room for the whole in the present Number :—

“I could wish, now that you candidly confess that you see the danger of conceding to the Papists those high places of power and trust, from which, in consequence of direful necessity, they have been excluded, that you had shown, at some length, the obviously infallible results of such concession. It is, in some measure, to remedy this inadvertency, or neglect, that I now address myself to you.

“I confess that my feelings were so shocked by the horrible story of the Inquisition seraglio, that I could not compose my mind to sleep during the whole night after I read it. It appears to me to tally so completely with the doctrine of the Jesuits, that it is lawful to destroy females that have it in their power to expose the wickedness of the priests, that I feel the fullest conviction, that these villanies have been for many ages practised, on a large scale, wherever circumstances favoured it. For, let it be observed, that Loyola’s rules for the Jesuits did not originate with himself, but were drawn out and compendized from the standing morality of the Popish communion. In proof of which, it is only necessary to notice the readiness and alacrity with which some outrages upon common sense and decency were at once received, and the irresistible power and efficacy with which they became established, wherever the Romish superstition prevailed.”

The writer proceeds to show how Jesuitism co-operated with infidelity in originating the French Revolution ; and how it is partly, if not wholly, chargeable with all the miseries that followed ; for much of the philosophical infidelity with which Europe was annoyed about the middle of the last century, may be traced to the morals taught and practised by the Jesuits, and other Popish absurdities and abominations. The advocates of the Jesuits, in the present day, stoutly maintain, that they are the best supporters of thrones ; and that, if the order had not been suppressed, the French Revolution would not have happened. To prove a negative is indeed a bold undertaking ; but Popish writers have, in general, little to do with *proof*. With them *assertion* is enough ; and I have learned, that the more strongly they assert any thing, the more ought they to be suspected of falsehood.



THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. CXXXIX.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, MARCH 10th, 1821.  
~~~~~

IN my last Number, I gave an extract of a letter relating the great activity of the Jesuits in England, their success in making proselytes to Popery, and the culpable supineness of the Protestant clergy, who are suffering their people to be deceived and ruined, without making any vigorous effort to defend the truth, and impede the progress of error. There are, however, a few honourable exceptions. In particular, the Editor of the "Protestant Advocate," a clergyman in Essex, has distinguished himself as a staunch defender of the Reformation. His motto is, no peace with Rome:—no compromise:—no truce with the insidious Jesuits, whose wily arts he well knows,—“arts which caused them to be expelled from all the Popish states in Europe scarcely fifty years ago,” when they found an asylum in the heart of England, where they continue to this day, increasing their numbers, and extending their influence. The Protestant Advocate not only wields his own pen to great purpose; but he does what in him lies to rouse his brethren to exert themselves in the cause of Christianity against Antichrist. His efforts have not yet produced the desired effect among the established clergy in Lancashire, where their labours are most wanted; but he makes honourable mention of some dissenters in that country who have taken up the cause, and are pursuing it with vigour. A society was lately formed there for the defence of Protestant principles, which circumstance was communicated to me, first by a private letter from Preston, and afterwards by a printed circular, detailing the design and object of the society. As I think this letter will be interesting to my readers, I shall insert it here. It is inserted also in the Protestant Advocate for December last.

“PRESTON, Nov. 27th, 1820.

“SIR,

“The unceasing efforts of the Romish priesthood and their adherents in this county to extend their influence, and to make proselytes of the ignorant and unwary, cannot, we presume, have altogether escaped your notice, though perhaps you may not be fully aware of the extent of the evil.

“In Preston, the proportion of the Roman Catholics is unusually great; and its proximity to the Jesuit college at Stonyhurst, (an institution, the influence of which on the surrounding country is most powerful and pernicious) renders it more easy for the leaders of the Catholic body to PRACTISE AND PROSPER here. They already

possess two large chapels, which are filled by crowded congregations, and have erected a spacious school, which, in various ways, is made subservient to the grand design of proselyting to the Church of Rome. For several years past, lectures on the distinguishing tenets of Popery, which have been attended by great numbers of Protestants of different denominations, have been delivered by one or other of their priests, thrice a week during Lent, in their principal chapel; the great object of which is to represent the Church of Rome as the only ark of salvation. Experience proves that such a representation has its influence on weak and uninformed minds.

"Very little opposition has hitherto been made to these attempts of the Roman Catholics to propagate their principles in this town and its vicinity. One vigorous effort of the late curate of our parish church appeared to have a beneficial influence. With a view to confute the errors of the Romish church, he delivered a course of lectures on Sunday evenings, which were very numerous attended, and which induced the priests to propose a truce, engaging that they would omit their usual lectures in Lent, if he would suspend his attacks on their system: and for one year these conditions were observed. The above clergyman, however, having left Preston more than three years ago, the Lent lectures have been renewed with greater zeal than ever; and as there does not appear any probability that a similar attempt will be made in the same quarter to resist these bold attacks on the Protestant religion, there seems to be a very urgent call on others to employ effective means for this purpose.

"It has therefore been thought expedient by several friends to general Protestantism, that a course of lectures in opposition to the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion should be delivered at some place of worship in this town, by able and zealous ministers from various parts of the county; to commence early in the ensuing year, and to be continued once a fortnight during three or four months. And that at the same time the very popular and useful tracts edited by Mr. M'Gavin, a respectable merchant in Glasgow, under the title of 'THE PROTESTANT,' should be put into general circulation.

"It is hoped that this attempt will not be considered as entirely a LOCAL business: but that it will be generally countenanced by all zealous friends to the cause of truth throughout the county; and that beginning as it were at the centre, the impulse will be felt on all sides, and lead to similar efforts wherever they may appear to be necessary.

"Conceiving that the intelligence contained in this circular will not be uninteresting: and that so far as circumstances may admit, you will be disposed to co-operate with us,—we have taken the liberty, Sir, to address these lines to you.

"Signed on behalf of the society for the support and diffusion of Protestant principles in Preston and its vicinity,

"W. M. WALKER, } Secretaries."  
"W. HOPE,

*List of Subjects proposed for the first course of Lectures.*

1. The Claims of the Church of Rome examined.
2. Scripture, not Tradition, the Rule of Faith.
3. The Pope not the Head of the Church.
4. On Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass.
5. On the Seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome.
6. On the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.
7. On Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead.
8. On Justification by Works, the Merits of Saints, and Works of Supererogation.
9. The Duty of Separation from the Church of Rome.

By a letter received from the Secretaries a few days ago, I have the pleasure of learning, to use their own words, that "the lectures here against Popery, as detailed in the circular we had the pleasure to hand you, are very well attended : and the tracts meet with a ready and extensive sale." I have the pleasure to learn also that these said tracts, or paper Protestants, have already excited great wrath among the Preston Papists ; and certain steps have been taken, preparatory, I presume, to an attempt to put them down by force of law, seeing they cannot meet them on the ground of reason and argument : at least I cannot otherwise account for the fact, which has come to my knowledge, of two Papists, with a legal adviser, going before a magistrate in Preston, and making oath that they had bought No. I. and II. of *THE PROTESTANT* from the bookseller, Mrs. Agnes Walker, of that town, which two Numbers they had appended to their affidavits. Perhaps, indeed, it was merely an attempt to frighten the good lady from selling the work ; and the fact confirms a statement by the author of the *History of the Jesuits*, that "such is the influence of the Jesuits in Preston, that the Protestant booksellers are afraid to sell publicly, or expose for sale, any books against Popery ; and yet there is a Popish bookseller in the town, whose windows and shop are crowded with all the poison of Popery." Vol. I. page 335. This is the manner in which Papists propagate and defend their principles, while under civil disabilities : we may then form a judgment of what they would do, if possessed of power. Circumscribed as their influence is, they are able by means of it, to obstruct the exercise of free discussion, in places where they have become numerous ; and should the period ever arrive when such men shall get into parliament, or even into the magistracy of such a town as Preston, it will be seen what havoc they will make of the boasted liberties of Englishmen.

With all their boasting and bluster, the Jesuits (for the name is proper to the English Papists in general,) are the greatest controversial cowards in the world. This is evident from their conduct in Preston. When they supposed there was no Protestant clergyman that would be at the pains to enter the lists with them,



they boldly proclaimed the peculiarities of their system, and attacked the established religion, which they held up to the scorn of the ignorant and besotted multitudes who listened to their harangues; but whenever a Protestant clergyman took up the cause, and had begun to turn the tide of public opinion against them, they begged for quarter. They know perfectly well that argument is not a weapon for them. By bold assertion and downright lying, they will succeed for a time, where no opposition is made; but let the question be brought to the test of plain fact and of common sense, and there is not a Papist in the world who will be able to maintain his ground for five minutes.

Had the Preston Jesuits been really convinced in their own consciences that their cause was good, they would not have proposed such a truce as that mentioned in the letter above inserted; and had the curate of the parish been duly impressed with the importance of the questions at issue, he would not have consented to the truce which was proposed. No doubt the priests of Diana, and of other idols, would gladly have purchased the silence of Paul with regard to Jesus of Nazareth, at the expense of not praising their *holy* images while the apostle remained among them; but had such a proposal been made to him, he would have spurned it with holy indignation:—"We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard," would have been his reason for continuing to preach the truth, whether men would hear, or whether they would forbear. I speak this upon the supposition that the idol priests had proposed a truce to him; but what would any man think, if he were told that Paul had made such a proposal to the idol priests?—If he had said,—Cease to inculcate the worship of Jupiter and Diana, and I shall say no more about Jesus Christ, What could any man infer, but that he felt no real interest in Christ or his religion? Yet this is the very thing that our Preston Jesuits did. They will maintain, that theirs is the only true religion, and that ours is a false one; and that the one is as much opposed to the other, as the worship of Christ is to the worship of an idol: and yet they, who thus claim to be of the only true religion, voluntarily proposed to give up the public defence of it, if the professors of a false religion would give up the defence of theirs! This is the fidelity of modern Jesuits to their *holy* church, which is the mother and mistress of all churches! The fact, however, is a striking one, and an encouraging one to all who undertake the exposure of Popish error, idolatry, and superstition. It is an admission, and a public acknowledgment by the leading Papists themselves, that their cause cannot be defended by fair argument, that it shrinks from public discussion, and that they are content to hold their faith in secret and in silence, where there are men able and willing to expose the deformity of the system when it is obtruded upon the view of the public. I recollect, that soon after my controversy with the Papists commenced, and while it was confined to the Glasgow Chronicle, a sort of roundabout proposal was made, that

if I would give it up, my opponents would do the same; but I felt no inclination to accept the proposal. I had not, like Hannibal, taken an oath of perpetual hostility to Rome; but I had by that time seen enough of her abominations to determine me to persevere in laying them open to the view of the world, that my highly favoured country might at least be warned of the danger of cherishing in her bosom the most insidious enemies of both her civil and religious privileges. And I soon found that no truce was necessary. My opponents have left me in undisputed possession of the field for a long period. Not one of them has the courage to draw a pen in defence of their *holy* and *infallible* church. Let the society in Preston persevere, and they shall have the same triumph. Let them not relax their efforts for a single day. Let them hold up to the world, by preaching and writing, the true system of Popery in its naked deformity. Let them exhibit in plain, intelligible, and forcible language, its ridiculous fooleries, its monstrous absurdities, and horrible impieties, and I venture to predict that the Jesuits, though not ashamed, for that they cannot be, will be glad to hold their peace, and wait a more favourable opportunity for putting forward their claims to public notice.

The vast wealth of the Jesuits' college in Lancashire has enabled them to extend their influence over a considerable part of the county; and from the little opposition they have met with, their impudence has become equal to their influence. "The influence of the Jesuits in the adjacent country is incredible. The Manor and surrounding district being their own, they are more or less the accredited heads of the neighbourhood; they are at once bold and indefatigable in making proselytes."—"Before the establishment of this college, there were not half a dozen Papists about Stonyhurst, but now the greater part of the population in that part of the county are Papists, to the amount of many thousands. From this Jesuits' college all the Roman Catholic chapels in that part of the kingdom (which are nearly as numerous as the Protestant churches) are filled with priests of the order of Jesuits, though they are unwilling that it should be known that they are any other than ordinary Romish priests. There are several Jesuit priests stationed in Preston, who frequently travel from thence to Ireland; and, since the last peace, they have great intercourse with France, and other parts of the continent."—

"The subtlety with which the Jesuits insinuate themselves into Protestant families of fortune is very remarkable, but quite in unison with their whole history: there is scarcely a single Protestant family of respectability which is not in a greater or less degree under the influence of the Jesuits. The bishop of the diocese himself has not escaped the vortex of their influence; and a relative of his, who is a beneficed clergyman, at no great distance from the college, is openly boasted of by the Jesuits, as their patron and ally; to this list may be added some of the established clergy of Preston and its vicinity. The Jesuits rule the magistrates of that

place, and the Mayor himself is in their interest." *History of the Jesuits, London, 1816, Vol. I. pages 344—5.*

The following will show the countenance which they receive from Protestants in Manchester, in the same county:—"On the 27th of September last, a magnificent chapel, dedicated to St. Augustin, was consecrated with high mass at Manchester. After consecration there was a public dinner, when, among other toasts were drank, 'Our *Protestant* friends, who have so liberally and generously contributed to the erection of St. Augustin's chapel.' Then, 'The Protestant visitors who attended St. Augustin's, and those who now honour us with their presence.'" And we are told that a "Mr. Wm. Townend (perhaps a misprint for Townsend) in a very appropriate manner, returned thanks on behalf of himself and the other Protestants alluded to; and with the liberality worthy of a Christian whose faith is built on rational principles, gave credit to those whose mode of faith was different, though drawn from the same source. It was a gratification to him to have witnessed the sight which had occupied his attention this day, and he hoped that the difference in the modes of faith would never be a barrier to prevent Catholics and Protestants stepping forward to promote the welfare of a fellow creature." Such it seems is the state of favour with which Papists are regarded in Manchester, that Protestants contribute to build their chapels, grace their consecration by their presence, and then honour the triumph of Popery by attending a commemorative dinner, where they receive compliments from the Jesuits for their *liberality*, and express the gratification which the superstitious and idolatrous consecration of a Popish chapel has afforded them. The Jesuits would no doubt affect to be greatly delighted with such an effusion of Protestant liberality as the above; but they would despise both the speech and the speaker in their hearts. They are acute enough to perceive that he is not truly a Protestant who can speak of his own faith and that of Rome as drawn from the same source, and, "built upon *rational* principles:" and in their own minds they would set him down as belonging to the infidel school, though they would profess to regard him as an enlightened and liberal Christian. I am far from saying or insinuating that Protestant principles are *irrational*, though they have neither their origin nor foundation in reason, but in divine revelation; but while Popery sets all sense and reason at defiance, and does so openly and avowedly in some of her fundamental doctrines, the Jesuits could not without gross hypocrisy acquiesce in the very liberal declaration of Mr. Townsend.

While such sentiments as this gentleman avows prevail among Protestants, who would not be alarmed by the increase of Popery? Merely nominal Protestants, like Mr. T. are already Papists at heart; and, as it is to be feared, the number of such is not small, in both England and Scotland, we have reason to fear that whenever it shall become necessary for every man to take a side, the Church of Rome will muster on her side the greater part, if not



all those who do not particularly interest themselves in religious matters. Such persons look upon the care of their souls as a painful drudgery; and they are very willing to pay a reasonable commission to any man who will take the work off their hands, and be answerable for them. The Romish priests offer their services for this very purpose. They make themselves responsible for the salvation of every soul that confides in their spiritual powers. By their sacraments, they can regenerate, and even absolve the vilest sinners without putting them to the painful necessity of hating sin and loving holiness. Now this is such a convenient system of religion, that every unregenerate man who can prevail upon himself to believe in the power of the priests, will most heartily embrace it; and therefore, as I have often said, whenever Popery shall become fashionable, and popular, the greater part of our fashionable population will fall into it.

Mr. Townsend seems to have been put forward, or to have thrust himself forward, on this occasion, as the organ of Manchester Protestants; and, if it be lawful to use the language of merchants on so grave a subject, I would say, if such be the sample, what must be the state and character of the stock? Mr. T. speaks of the difference between his own religion and that of Papists, as only different modes of faith:—He “gave credit to those whose mode of faith was different, though drawn from the same source.” It is really very difficult to speak of nonsense in a sensible manner; and therefore, I may be excused, if I shall not be able to apprehend and illustrate distinctly what the speaker means. By “modes of faith,” I suppose is meant, if the phrase mean any thing, different ways of believing some truth or some falsehood. I know the phrase has been sanctioned, *consecrated*, if you will, by a Popish infidel:—

“For *modes of faith* let graceless zealots fight:—  
His can’t be wrong whose life is in the right.”

But Alexander Pope’s faith was not founded on the word of God; and though this celebrated aphorism of his, taken in the most favourable light, expresses a mere truism, \* it is not of authority enough to impart sense to nonsense. They must be “graceless zealots” indeed who fight about “modes of faith;” that is, the manner in which they should believe, without knowing what it is that they are to believe.

\* That his faith cannot be wrong whose life is in the right, is undoubtedly true, though not in the sense intended by the poet. He meant to represent a man’s faith, or “mode of faith,” as of little importance, provided his life were good, which he supposed it might be, whatever might be his faith, which is a great and dangerous error. For a man’s life to be right requires entire submission of heart and conduct to the will of God; now this is His will that we believe on him whom he hath sent. Without this, a man’s life cannot be right, however blameless or even benevolent it may appear before the world, for he is destitute of the principle from which alone obedience, acceptable to God, can proceed: but with this faith in Christ, both a man’s heart and life will be right before God, and his conduct before men will make it appear that his faith is genuine.

Now I shall agree with our Manchester Protestants so far as to admit, that the difference between the Protestant and Popish *mode of faith* is not worth disputing about, unless we take into account the *object* of faith. If, for instance, the question be, how, or in what mode we shall believe that the Virgin Mary hears, and is able to answer the prayers of millions of worshippers ;—how, or in what mode we shall believe that a divine power resides in holy images and holy relics ;—how, and in what mode we shall believe that what we see to be a wafer is the God that made us ;—how, and in what mode we shall believe that a fellow-creature, and one whom we know to be a sinful creature, has the power of absolving us from our sins ;—how, and in what mode we shall believe in the divine efficacy of the sacraments of penance and extreme unction, so as to assure us of salvation by their means :—If, I say, the question be, what is the mode or manner of our faith with regard to these, and all such things ; that is, whether we believe them with a great faith or a little faith ; a *believing* faith, or a *doubting* faith, I shall cheerfully admit that the thing is of no importance whatever :—All the supposable modes of faith about such objects are not worth disputing about, or of being compared with one another.

But if the question be with regard to any matter of divine revelation,—such, for instance, as the divine testimony about Jesus Christ as the only Saviour of sinners, I think there is no room for “modes of faith” in relation to it. Those to whom the truth is presented in the Bible, either believe it or they do not. If they believe it, they become Christians in the Bible sense of the word ; if they do not believe it, they are not Christians ; that is, they have no interest in Christ ; but continue in their sins, though they may be called by his name. This is the order which Christ himself has established :—“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life ; he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John iii. ult. And there can be nothing more just and proper, than that one who does not believe a message of good news should derive no benefit from it, especially when his disbelief implies a malignant rejection of the good thing contained in the message. This good thing is the gospel, which is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance ; and though there is no merit in the belief of it, it is the established order in the divine administration, that he who believes it shall be saved. Now we read nothing in the Bible of different modes of believing, or “modes of faith,” which is the same thing. There are some strong, and some weak in the faith ; but this does not imply different modes of faith, any more than a state of childhood and a state of manhood suppose different modes of existence.

A friend has kindly handed me the Popish book mentioned in my last. The true title of it is, “The faith of Catholics *confirmed* by Scripture, and *attested* by the Fathers of the five first centuries.” The authors are Benington and Kirk, not Thake, as the word seemed to be in the manuscript.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXL.

---

SATURDAY, MARCH 17th, 1821.

---

THE impudence of the Jesuits appears in the very name which they assume. Other Orders are content to be called after the name of their respective founders, such as St. Francis and St. Dominic; but nothing less will please the disciples of Loyola than the name of Jesus, who was so named because he was to save his people from their sins. The system of Jesuitism is founded on falsehood, and supported in every department of it by imposition, part of which consists in giving the best names to the worst things and thus a confraternity, established for the purpose of opposing truth and maintaining error and idolatry, acted quite in character when they called themselves "the Society of Jesus."

This society, which was formed for the express purpose of opposing the Reformation which had begun under Luther, originated with a Spaniard of the name of Ignatius Loyola. He had been a soldier, and had seen a good deal of service. He was of a romantic and enthusiastic cast of mind, and had his imagination heated by reading the lives of saints and heroes, particularly, the Adventures of Amadis de Gaul, which makes such a conspicuous figure in the exploits and adventures of the far-famed Don Quixote; and the effect upon the mind of Ignatius seems to have been in reality, what it is fictitiously represented to have been in the case of the renowned Knight of La Mancha. Ignatius hesitated a long time before he could determine whether he should become a knight errant, or a saint errant; but considering at length that he was lame of one leg, from a wound which he had received in the wars, and was in consequence unable to make an upright knightly figure among ladies of quality, he resolved to abandon the path of military glory, and follow that of St. Francis, and other great fathers of the church. Still however he had a hankering after the practices and the rules of knighthood, one of the most essential of which is, that he should have a lady of incomparable beauty, who should be the object of his devotions, and who should receive the glory of all his victories and triumphs. It cost Don Quixote a whole week to satisfy himself that Dulcinea del Toboso was a fit object for him; but we are not informed how long it took for Ignatius to fix his mind upon the Virgin Mary. This, however, was the result of his cogitations; for he prostrated himself one night before her image, and consecrated himself to her service, and that of her Son; vowed inviolable fidelity to her;



made her his protectress, and ever after esteemed himself bound to her by all the laws of knighthood.

This solemn engagement made it imperative on him to knock any man on the head who should speak a word in disparagement of any of the real or supposed qualities of his mistress: and he had soon an opportunity of proving his fidelity; for riding on a pilgrimage to Montserrat, he fell in with a Moor, who stoutly disputed with him the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin; and history saith, that the Moor had the better of the argument. It immediately occurred to Ignatius that he ought to kill him; but as the Moors were stout and warlike men, it perhaps occurred to Ignatius, that unless he received assistance from the Virgin or some other saint, the Moor might kill him. He rode on, expecting some revelation or impulse, but nothing of the kind was forthcoming. At last, the Moor's path separated from his; and he, receiving no revelation from above, resolved to seek one from below, namely, from the ass that walked under him; \* for he laid the bridle loose upon the beast's neck, resolving within himself, that if the ass took the same path with the Moor, he should follow and kill him; and if he took the other path, he would consider it as a supernatural intimation not to shed blood at that time. Happily the ass turned away from the road the Moor had taken, and Ignatius was prevented from committing murder, or being murdered, for it has never yet been proved which of the two would have happened. The writers of his life call this a miracle; and it is indeed as good as most of the incidents which Papists call miraculous. See Extracts from his Life by Bohours, in a work entitled, *The Enthusiasm of the Church of Rome*, 4to, p. 29.

My readers will probably be of opinion that such a mad enthusiast was more fit for bedlam, than for being at the head of a powerful sect that was destined to govern the greater part of the civilized world, and even to establish a great empire among the savages of South America. Ignatius at first found some difficulty in getting his order established. The Pope himself was at first unfriendly to the measure; but "Loyola removed all his scruples by an offer which it was impossible for any Pope to resist. He proposed that besides the three vows of poverty, chastity, and monastic obedience, which are common to all the monastic Orders, the members of his society should take a fourth vow of obedience to the Pope, binding themselves to go whithersoever he should command for the service of religion; and without requiring any thing of the Holy See for their support. At a time when the papal

\* I hope no Papist will accuse me of profane levity for supposing that inspiration might enter into such a saint as Ignatius from below, through the medium of his saddle; for let it be remembered, it is the only way that infallibility finds access into a Pope. It is all communicated from the chair of St. Peter, when, with due solemnity, he has set himself down upon it.

authority had received such a shock by the revolt of so many nations from the Roman Church ; at a time when every part of the popish system was attacked with so much violence and success, the acquisition of such a body of men, thus peculiarly devoted to the See of Rome, and whom it might set in opposition to all its enemies, was an object of the highest consequence. Paul, instantly conceiving this, confirmed the institution of the Jesuits by a bull ; granted the most ample privileges to the members of the society ; and appointed Loyola to be the first general of the Order. The event hath fully justified Paul's discernment in expecting such beneficial consequences to the See of Rome from this institution. In less than half a century, the society obtained establishments in every country that adhered to the Roman Catholic Church ; its power and wealth increased amazingly ; the number of its members became great ; their character and accomplishments were still greater ; and the Jesuits were celebrated by the friends, and dreaded by the enemies of the Romish faith, as the most able and enterprising order in the church.

"The constitution and laws of the society were perfected by Laynez and Aquaviva, the two generals who succeeded Loyola, men far superior to their master in abilities, and in the science of government. They framed that system of profound and artful policy which distinguishes the Order."—"From their first institution they considered the education of youth as their peculiar province ; they aimed at being spiritual guides and confessors ; they preached frequently in order to instruct the people ; they set out as missionaries to convert unbelieving nations. The novelty of the institution, as well as the singularity of its objects, procured the Order many admirers and patrons. The governors of the society had the address to avail themselves of every circumstance in its favour, and in a short time, the number as well as the influence of its members increased wonderfully. Before the expiration of the sixteenth century, the Jesuits had obtained the chief direction of the education of youth in every Catholic country in Europe. They had become the confessors of almost all its monarchs, a function of no small importance in any reign, but under a weak prince, superior even to that of minister. They were the spiritual guides of almost every person eminent for rank or power. They possessed the highest degree of confidence and interest with the papal court, as the most able and zealous champions for its authority. The advantages which an active and enterprising body of men might derive from all these circumstances are obvious. They formed the minds of men in their youth. They retained an ascendant over them in their advanced years. They possessed at different periods the direction of the most considerable courts in Europe. They mingled in all affairs. They took part in every intrigue and revolution. The general by means of the extensive intelligence which he received could regulate the operations of the

Order with the most perfect discernment, and by means of his absolute power could carry them on with the utmost vigour and effect."

"Unhappily for mankind, the vast influence which the Order of Jesuits acquired by all these different means, has been often exerted with the most pernicious effect. Such was the tendency of that discipline observed by the society in forming its members, and such the fundamental maxims in their constitution, that every Jesuit was taught to regard the interest of the Order as the capital object, to which every consideration was to be sacrificed. This spirit of attachment to their Order, the most ardent perhaps that ever influenced any body of men, is the characteristic principle of the Jesuits, and serves as a key to the genius of their policy, and to the peculiarities of their sentiments and conduct.

"As it was for the honour and advantage of the society, that its members should possess an ascendant over persons of high rank and great power, the desire of acquiring and preserving such a direction of their conduct, with greater facility, has led the Jesuits to propagate a system of relaxed and pliant morality, which accommodates itself to the passions of men, which justifies their vices, which tolerates their imperfections, and authorises almost every action that the most audacious or crafty politician would wish to perpetrate."—"They have published such tenets concerning the duty of opposing princes who were enemies of the Catholic faith, as countenanced the most atrocious crimes, and tended to dissolve all the ties which connect subjects with their rulers." *Robertson's Charles V. Book VI.* I refer to this elegant historian for a more particular account of the principles on which the society was founded; and the power, influence, and wealth which it acquired.

After this short sketch of the Order by a Protestant historian, it is but fair to insert what their own writers have to say in their behalf. It is admitted on all hands, that the great object of the institution of the Jesuits was the overthrow of the Reformation. The following extract from VILLERS will set this matter in its true light. I quote from a recent publication—"The History of the Jesuits," vol. I. p. 371—374.

"The sixteenth century saw LUTHER and LOYOLA arise almost at the same moment; the one in the north, the other in the south, of Europe: the latter, a Spaniard, appeared to be a natural product of the soil and spirit of the country where he was reared. A century earlier, he would probably only have founded an Order, like so many others, a fraternity of worshippers of the Virgin, to whom his devotion was particularly addressed. The religious innovations, however, which then threatened the existence of the Romish Church, gave to the enthusiasm of the pious and warlike Ignatius another direction. He conceived the idea of a sort of spiritual crusade against heresy. His scheme was eagerly adopted at Rome after some hesitation; and the design was seriously



formed of converting the new society into a formidable phalanx, which might be employed against the boldest champions of the Reformation. To the reaction, therefore, excited by that event, may be ascribed the origin of the society of Jesus. It will probably be satisfactory to read the words of DAMIANUS, one of the first historians of the Order, who thus expresses himself in his *Synopsis Historiæ Soc. Jesu ; primo seculo*, printed in 1640.

"In the same year 1521, LUTHER, with consummate wickedness, openly declared war against the church :—wounded in the fortress of Pampeluna, renovated and strengthened by his accident, IGNATIUS raised the standard in defence of religion.

"LUTHER attacks the chair of St. Peter with abuse and blasphemy : IGNATIUS is miraculously cured by St. Peter in order to become his defender.\*

"LUTHER, tempted by rage, ambition, and lust, abandons the religious life : IGNATIUS, eagerly obeying the call of God, quits the profane for the religious life.

"LUTHER, with the guilt of sacrilege, contracts an incestuous marriage, with a virgin of the Lord : IGNATIUS binds himself with the vow of perpetual continence.

"LUTHER despises all authority of superiors : the first precepts of IGNATIUS, full of Christian humility, are to submit and obey.

"LUTHER, like a madman, declaims against the Apostolic See : IGNATIUS every where undertakes its defence.

"LUTHER withdraws from it as many as he can : as many as he can, IGNATIUS reconciles and restores to it.

"All the devices and efforts of LUTHER are directed against it : IGNATIUS consecrates to it, by a special vow, all his own labours, and all those of his companions.

"LUTHER has stripped the sacred rites of the church of all their venerable solemnity : IGNATIUS studies to procure them reverence.

"The Sacrifice of the Mass, the Eucharist, the Virgin Mother of God, the Guardian Angels, and the Indulgences of Popes, which LUTHER attacks with so much fury, are the objects, which IGNATIUS and his companions exert themselves continually to celebrate with new inventions and indefatigable industry.

"To LUTHER, that disgrace of Germany, that Epicurean Swine, that curse of Europe, that monster destructive to the whole earth, hateful to God and man, &c. God by his eternal decree has opposed IGNATIUS.

"In truth, the new society acquitted itself faithfully in the new

\* There is a little mistake here ; for Ignatius was not properly cured at all. His leg was never made straight, which, as we have seen, was the reason why he despaired of making a genteel figure among ladies. Now we never read in the Bible of miraculous cures being incomplete ; and we may very reasonably conclude, that the apostle Peter had no hand in the setting of this saint's leg, which was done in such an insufficient manner.

service to which it was destined from its origin. A great number of Catholic associations and fraternities, to which the general movement of the human mind gave rise at that period, appeared and eclipsed one another without glory—like those meteors which shine for a short time in the atmosphere, and leave no trace behind them. The Society of Jesus, however, rose above the horizon, like an awful comet, which scatters terror among the nations. While it was scarcely yet established, it rendered important service to the Holy See, during the sitting of the Council of Trent, and powerfully influenced the decrees of that assembly. The ancient Orders, especially the Mendicant, conceived great envy against these new-comers, who set out with so much celebrity, and attracted all consideration and all favours. This emulation redoubled the activity of all such as were not Jesuits, and in particular of the Dominicans, who wielded in a more terrible manner than ever the sword of the Inquisition, entrusted to their hands. The Jesuits however outstripped all their rivals, acquired the unlimited favour of the Pontiffs, and an immense power through the whole Catholic world. To them, and to the Popes, missions were the same as colonies to political governments, a source of wealth and power."

The reader will perceive that a great part of the above is a panegyric upon the Order of Jesuits and their founder; and their excellence is represented as consisting almost exclusively in the support which they have afforded to the Church and See of Rome. Every one, therefore, who believes the Church of Rome to be Antichrist, (and what Protestant does not?) must be convinced that the Jesuits are the active agents of the prince of darkness—the sworn enemies of real Christianity, and of every real follower of Christ: and it must necessarily follow, that wherever they have power and influence, these will be exercised to put down the religion of the Bible, and establish idolatry and superstition in its place. They are actually under a solemn vow to effect this by all possible means; and their efforts are the more likely to succeed, from their affected liberality, and plausible manners, and from their taking care never to divulge their real and ultimate design in any measure which they take to obtain a footing and extend their influence in Protestant countries.

No other Order in the Church of Rome increased with so much rapidity to wealth and power, or made such a figure in the world as the Jesuits. "When Loyola, in the year 1540, petitioned the Pope to authorise the institution of the Order, he had only ten disciples. But in the year 1608, sixty eight years after the first institution, the number of Jesuits had increased to 10,581. In the year 1710, the Order possessed 24 *professed* houses; 59 houses of probation; 340 residences; 612 colleges; 200 missions; 150 seminaries and boarding schools; and consisted of 19,998 Jesuits." *Robertson's Charles V. Book VI.*

These were actually so many incendiaries sent forth to embroil the nations of the world—to set them, and to keep them fighting

with one another. From being the confessors of kings, and of their mistresses, and of ministers of state, they became acquainted with the secrets of every cabinet. These were communicated to their general at Rome, who was either a tool of the Pope, or had the Pope as a tool of his; and thus he had the command of a machine by which he could influence, and often even guide the measures of every court in Europe,\* except those who had renounced the Pope, and thrown off his yoke; and even some of these were more influenced by the Jesuits than the world knew at the time. Their influence in England was most pernicious, and was uninterrupted from the accession of Elizabeth to the revolution in 1688, for it was their incessant plotting against the life and government of that princess, that laid her under the necessity of having recourse to certain rigorous and arbitrary measures, which considerably diminish the respect due to her memory, and laid the foundation of those discontents which agitated the country during the reign of succeeding princes. In Elizabeth's time, it was the practice of Jesuits to assume the character of zealous Protestant preachers; and thus to insinuate themselves into the confidence of the people, that they might the more effectually practise their treasonable arts. I shall at present relate only one instance of this, which may be verified by reference to the registry of the Episcopal See of Rochester, in the book which begins, Anno 2 & 3 Phil. & Mar. and continued to the 15 Eliz. I abridge the narrative from a volume entitled, "Foxes and Firebrands," the title of which seems to have been intended to point out the character of the Jesuits.

In the year 1568, one Thomas Heth came to the Dean of Rochester, and pretending to be a poor minister, requested the dean's influence with the bishop for some preferment. The dean very properly desired to hear him preach before he would recommend him. Accordingly he did preach in the cathedral church; and while doing so, on pulling out his handkerchief, he pulled out also a letter which, unobserved by him, fell to the bottom of the pulpit, and was afterwards picked up by the sexton, and carried to the dean. This letter was addressed to Heth, under the name of Thomas Fine, and subscribed by Samuel Malt, a notorious English Jesuit, at that time in Madrid. The entire letter is given in the work before me, from which it appears that money had been sent along with it, to be distributed by Heth wherever he thought it might be done to advantage. The writer acknowledges having heard of his popularity as a preacher, and advises him to persevere, with certain cautions not to overdo the work; and he is encouraged by the information that three of his brethren had been sent into Germany, to sow dissention among the heretics

\* *D'Alembert* compared the society to a naked sword, the hilt of which was at Rome.



there. This letter being shown to the bishop, he ordered Heth to be apprehended; and he was brought to an examination, in which he shuffled not a little. "After his examination," says my author, "it was resolved to send to Heth's lodgings, at the Queen's Arms in Rochester, where, upon search, in one of his boots were found his beads, and several papers, among which was a license from the fraternity of the Jesuits, and a bull dated the first of *Pius Quintus*, to preach what doctrine that society pleased for the dividing of Protestants, particularly naming the English Protestants by the name of heretics. In his trunk were found several books for denying baptism to infants, with several other horrid blasphemies, which being brought before the whole assembly then present, the bishop adjourned the court, appointing another day for farther investigation, till they had acquainted her Majesty and her honourable council with these passages, and sent for farther instructions how to proceed in the affair. In the meantime Heth was committed a close prisoner, and manacled, till order came from the board."

When Heth was called again into court, the bishop addressed him in a very solemn manner, pointing out the wickedness of his conduct. It appeared by the evidence of the persons with whom he had lodged, that, in order to remove suspicion of his being a Jesuit, he spake against that Order; and by his own confession, it was his practice to preach against Rome, by which he knew he would readily command a hearing; yet all this was with a view to subvert the Reformation and restore Popery. The poor man suffered the reward of his treachery by being three days exposed on the pillory at Rochester, and being subjected to other cruel indignities, which I would not wish the most wicked Jesuit of the present age to suffer. He was condemned to perpetual imprisonment; but he died in the course of a few months. Here I cannot forbear quoting the concluding part of the bishop's address to the court, on the conviction of this Jesuit, as the words seem not inapplicable to our own times. "Therefore, my brethren, consider the condition of your souls. If you start aside once from your principles, having the right way so plainly set before you, you will not only run into Popish slavery again, but be in peril of a total confusion of soul and body; and if Rome get once her foot upon these dominions again, not only yourselves and your children, but Your princes and nobles shall become slaves to her idolatry."

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXLI.

---

SATURDAY, MARCH 24th, 1821.

---

MY last Number gave a short sketch of the rise, progress, character, and power of the Jesuits. I might go a great deal more into detail in these matters; but this is the less necessary, seeing a work has lately been published, which affords the most ample information on the subject. It is entitled, "A History of the Jesuits: to which is prefixed, a Reply to Mr. Dallas' Defence of that Order," in two volumes, London, 1816. Who Mr. Dallas is, I do not know, but from the extracts of his work, which are given in the reply, I suppose he is himself a Jesuit. He does, in a most Jesuitical manner, slur over every thing that militates against the character of the society, and endeavours to make them appear the most meritorious body that ever was in the world. The task which he undertook was sufficiently arduous, and one in which no ordinary man could be expected to succeed; and Mr. Dallas himself found it impossible to succeed in it, without applying a sponge to almost all that has been written for two hundred and fifty years, on the ecclesiastical, and even the civil affairs of Europe, except what was written by the Jesuits, and their admirers. This is one of the ways in which Papists endeavour to screen themselves from the scorn and contempt of the world. They deny every historical fact recorded by Protestant historians that bears the least reflection upon their Church; and though the names of fifty witnesses were adduced, all must go for nothing, because they are enemies of the "Catholic faith." This, in the opinion of the Jesuits, disqualifies any man from giving a true or credible testimony; and thus, by denying the truth of all history, except what it suits himself to admit, Mr. Dallas finds the Jesuits a most meritorious, and much injured body of men.

I come now to relate the story of the decline and fall of this powerful body, together with their recent restoration by the present Pope, and before I have done with them, I may give a sketch of

their morals from their *Secreta Monita*. "Though the power of the Jesuits had become so extensive, and though their interests generally prospered during a period of more than two centuries, their progress was by no means uninterrupted; and by their own misconduct, they soon excited the most formidable counteractions. Scarcely had they effected their establishment in France, in defiance of the parliaments and universities, when their existence was endangered by the fanaticism of their own members. John Chastel, one of their pupils, made an attempt upon the life of Henry IV.; and father Guiscard, another of the Order, was convicted of composing writings favourable to regicide."

"Their power was brought to a very low ebb, when the war of 1756 broke out, which occasioned the famous law-suit that led to their final overthrow. By that time the society had indicated many symptoms of decay, both in point of talents and activity, and had rendered themselves at once contemptible and odious. They had disgusted the court by their scruples, irritated the philosophers by their clamours, exasperated the other religious orders by their persecutions, and alienated the public by their long and insolent domination. A reasonable pretext was all that was wanted to put down a sect, which had long ceased to be either popular or formidable. The opportunity was soon furnished by their own imprudent obstinacy. The war recently commenced, had occasioned great losses in their trade with Martinico, (for the Jesuits were merchants upon a very great scale) the weight of which would have fallen in part upon the society's correspondents at Lyons and Marseilles. The merchants, however, alleged that the Jesuits in France were responsible for the debts of their missionaries in America, and insisted upon being indemnified from the funds of the Order. The claim was resisted and a law-suit commenced, which the Jesuits, by virtue of their privilege, removed from the provincial parliament to the great chamber at Paris. This measure rendered the dispute, and their defeat, subjects of more general notoriety. They were condemned to pay large sums to the adverse party, and prohibited thenceforth from meddling in commercial concerns. The sources of their wealth were thus diminished, and their enemies encouraged to renewed attacks. The questions at issue in the commercial dispute, had given the magistrates a plausible occasion for demanding to inspect the constitutions of the society; and in a luckless hour for themselves, they consented to produce their books. The parliament instantly saw, and seized the advantage which they had gained, and resolved to effect the destruction of the Order."

"In March 1762, the French court received intelligence of the capture of Martinico by the British; and dreading the storm of public indignation, resolved to divert the exasperated feelings of the nation, by yielding the Jesuits to their impending fate."—I



must confess that this itself was very like a Jesuitical trick. It would have been more honourable for the French government to have condemned the Jesuits upon the ground of their own demerits, than to have made them a sacrifice to appease popular clamour; but this is a point which Papists may settle among themselves. "On the 6th of August, 1762, their (the Jesuits) institute was condemned by the parliament, as contrary to the laws of the state, to the obedience due to the sovereign, and to the welfare of the kingdom. The Order was dissolved, and their effects alienated. But still the members, though no longer dressed in their religious habit, continued to hover about the court; and, had they preserved their original cautious and prudent policy, might have succeeded in recovering their privileges. But former successes inspired them with a fatal confidence. One of the archbishops, indignant that the parliament should presume to dispense with ecclesiastical vows, issued a mandate in favour of the Jesuits, and the fathers were accused of having employed themselves too industriously in the circulation of this paper. The parliament took the alarm, and pronounced a decree, that every Jesuit, whether professor or novice, should, within eight days, make oath that he renounced the institution, or quit the kingdom. In a body whose moral principles were so relaxed, and whose members, while it existed, scrupled no subtleties in promoting its interests, it is a remarkable circumstance, that, as secularized individuals, they acted in this instance with strict integrity, and refused the alternative of the oath. They were, therefore, ordered to quit the kingdom, and this judgment was executed with the utmost rigour. The poor, the aged, the sick, were included in the general proscription. But in certain quarters where the provincial parliaments had not decided against them, Jesuits still subsisted; and a royal edict was afterwards promulgated, which formally abolished the society in France, but permitted its members to reside within the kingdom with certain restrictions.

"In Spain, where they conceived their establishment to be perfectly secure, they experienced an overthrow equally complete, and more unexpected." "The example of the king of Spain was immediately followed by Ferdinand VI. of Naples, and soon after by the princes of Parma. They had been expelled from England in 1604; from Venice in 1606; and from Portugal in 1759, upon the charge of having instigated the families of Tavora and D'Aveiro to assassinate king Joseph I. Frederick the Great of Prussia was the only monarch who showed a disposition to afford them protection; but in 1773, the Order was entirely suppressed by Pope Clement XIV. who is supposed to have fallen a victim to their vengeance. It was long a current story at Rome, that this pontiff was accustomed to withdraw in the course of the grand mass to take some refreshment; and that a young priest, on one of

these occasions, brought chocolate to his holiness, and immediately withdrew; that the proper officiating priest soon after appeared with another cup, the Pope shook his head, as conscious of having received a fatal potion; that he pined from that day of a lingering disease which reduced his body to the appearance of a skeleton; and that he was known to have said, in allusion to the secret cause of his death, "I am going to eternity, and I know for what!"—*Edin. Ency. Art. Jesuits.*

"The history of the Jesuits from the period of their suppression to their revival by the present Pope, lies within a very narrow compass. That they have by any means ceased to exist as individuals, although they have done so as a body, will hardly have been imagined for a moment, even by those who possess the fewest means of information on the subject. They have still survived, in obscurity—the ghosts of their departed greatness—in reduced numbers—with diminished resources, and an exhausted credit; hating, indeed, to look back upon their former flourishing condition, but not without hope that, so long as Popery should maintain her footing in the world, and especially, if ever she should resume any considerable portion of her ancient power, they could not fail to be recognized by all who were not thoroughly acquainted with their history, as the most vigilant and active friends of the Church of Rome. The event has shown that they have not been disappointed. In spite of all the quarrels of that Church with the Jesuits; in spite of the mutual struggle for pre-eminence which has been ever maintained between them; their agency is still too important to be overlooked or despised by that mystical woman of the Apocalypse, who has her seat upon the seven mountains. There is still too much in common between the two systems: their corruptions are too nearly allied, and their interests too closely interwoven, to render it a matter of small import whether the Jesuits shall be again invoked by Papal Rome as her auxiliaries, or not: the influence of light in the world is too strong—the diffusion of the Bible has become too general—and the increase of true religion, in consequence, is too certain to permit a church which loves darkness rather than light, to neglect all the means which lie within her reach, to establish and perpetuate her own system of ignorance and error, by those friends and agents, whose interests are in the main identified with her own.

"The present Pope could not be ignorant that the same causes which led to the formation of the society, were at this moment in active operation throughout the world, and therefore appeared to require the application of the same remedy. 'The Order of Jesuits,' says Villers, 'the most important of all the Orders, was placed in opposition to the Reformation, and it acquired a preponderance proportioned to the enormous mass which it was intended to counterbalance.' It is with reference to the same great

object of *opposing the Reformation*, that the present Pope has declared that he should 'deem himself guilty of a great crime towards God, if, amidst the dangers of the Christian Republic,' (in other words, the cause of Popery), 'he should neglect to employ the aids which the special providence of God had put in his power, and, if placed in the bark of St. Peter, and tossed by continual storms, he should refuse to employ *the vigorous and experienced Rowers who volunteer their services!!!*' It is in vain that the advocates of his holiness will contend that he desired the aid of the Jesuits against infidelity; for where is the danger to be apprehended from infidelity now? It is against the Protestant Church and cause that the Jesuits, those '*experienced Rowers*,' have now embarked afresh, and it is chiefly with reference to their assistance in making head against the vessel of the Reformation that the Pope has availed himself of their services.—*Hist. Jesuits*, vol. ii. p. 395.

It is not difficult to perceive that the Pope, by the restoration of the Order of Jesuits, meant no favour to those Protestant powers; particularly Great Britain, who had been the chief instrument of his preservation, in the days of his humiliation, under the iron yoke of Buonaparte. It belongs to the nature of Popery not to feel grateful for favours received from heretics. The fact is, there is nothing that heretics can confer upon Papists that will be considered as a favour. Papists consider themselves the lords of the soil wherever they have at any time had an establishment; and whatever service Protestants may render them, it is never considered as a favour, but as a debt which was justly due. Thus for all the kindness which was exercised in making provision for Romish priests in this country, on the breaking out of the French Revolution, when they were banished from their homes, we have been requited by an establishment of Jesuits in the heart of the country; and, as if this were not enough, his holiness issues a Bull restoring the Order, which, in every country in Europe, had been suppressed as an insufferable nuisance, to all their former powers and privileges, that they may promote Popery in England, and wherever else they may obtain a footing. The Pope will say that this is for the good of those countries, and of England in particular, and thus he may acquit himself of the charge of ingratitude; but persons who understand the subject will consider the affected benevolence of his holiness, as resembling the good will of a wolf, who has a great affection for a flock of sheep.

The Pope says he would think himself guilty of a crime if he were not to enlist, in the service of the Church, those "*experienced Rowers, who volunteer their services*;"—that is, who offer themselves voluntarily, to go into all the world, particularly into Britain and Ireland, to endeavour to overturn the Protestant religion, which is the same thing as true Christianity, and to establish.



instead of it, the abominable superstition and idolatry of Rome. This is the object of these "experienced Rowers." The society was originally formed for the express purpose of putting down the Reformation; and its restoration, after being dormant for half a century, is for the purpose of extirpating what remains of real Christianity in Protestant countries.

Much as England was annoyed by the Jesuits, in the reign of Elizabeth, and for nearly a century thereafter, the impression of the evil is almost effaced from our minds. We have seen little of the Order with our own eyes, and we have felt little of their impertinent interference in our personal and domestic affairs; and therefore, we are apt to think lightly of them, as no more dangerous to our peace and comfort than those ideal beings the Brownies and Fairies, of whom we used to read and hear wonderful stories in our childhood. But persons who live nearer the seat of their power, and who have perhaps personal recollections of what they were in the days of their glory, feel more acutely on the subject of their restoration. This appears from the following fact, which I give from the *Orthodox Journal*, for October 1818, the editor of which is the avowed panegyrist of the Jesuits:—

"The most gratifying information we have to communicate this month to our readers, and to every friend of religion and virtue, is the restoration of the learned and eminent society of Jesuits in the canton of Friburg, in Switzerland, which example Soleure is expected to follow. The particulars of this pleasing intelligence will be found in the annexed article, extracted from the foreign papers." Then follow the particulars, relating to the establishment, privileges, and provision which the canton makes for the society: after which we have the following information:—"The Paris papers of the 18th instant, state, that 'the discontent at Friburg was so great, in consequence of the resolution of the great council for restoring the Jesuits, that several of the inhabitants are preparing to abandon the country, and to emigrate to America.'" The alarm excited in the minds of these honest Friburgers was perfectly natural, considering the well known character of the men who were to obtain a legal establishment among them, with many great privileges, and much wealth, which would be employed to bring every family and every individual into bondage; but the *Orthodox* editor, who seems to be a Jesuit himself, treats their fears in the following taunting and unfeeling manner. "Surely there must be something tremendously hideous and terrifying in the visage and character of a Jesuit, that these Friburgers prefer abandoning their relatives and country rather than behold the countenance of one of these monsters." Surely, I say, it is so, there is something tremendously hideous, not in the countenance, but in the character of "these monsters" of deceit, and this is not the less terrifying that it does not appear in the countenance, but lies hid in the heart, which is

full of rancour and hatred of the truth, and of those who profess it; and will show itself in active hostility, whenever there is a favourable opportunity.

But, says Mr. Andrews, "to what part of America these Jesuit haters mean to brush, the French journalists have not informed us. If they go to the United States, they will verify the old proverb, 'out of the frying-pan into the fire;' since there is not a state, we believe, out of the whole thirteen, in which the Jesuits are restricted from exercising their extraordinary and useful abilities. The American government, soaring above that narrow and grovelling passion which rules the enemies of the Jesuits, have granted to their college of Georgetown, in Maryland, all the privileges of a University; a favour highly creditable to the bestowed, and honourable to the bestowers." Thus it seems the Jesuits are spreading over the face of the earth like locusts; and wherever they shall make a lodgment, they will have a most deadly influence on all that is vital and sound in Christianity.

The editor of the Orthodox Journal is evidently the advocate and organ of the Jesuits in England; and since I have a volume of his work before me, I shall give a quotation which lets us into the secret of the manner in which the Jesuits satisfy their consciences that they may lawfully take the oath of supremacy; that is, swear that the king is head of the Church of England. The words are those of a correspondent; but the editor gives them without animadversion, from which we may infer that the sentiments are his own, and those of the body whose cause he advocates:—

"Our hopes in the last parliament, (that of 1819) are entirely blasted; but we ought not, therefore, wholly to despair, but make one noble effort yet, by the next session. In order to render our endeavours the more hopeful, let us be as *condescending* as possible, and conscience will in *any wise allow*. You seem afraid, had Lord Gray's motion succeeded, that some of our great ones might, without scruple, acknowledge the supremacy. But why not within the proper sphere? What harm can be therein? Our kings have always, since Harry's days, claimed it; their Church all along owned it in them, and I think, we have no reason or motive to dispute it; for it is entirely a matter of indifference to us who is head of that Church, or whether it have any such or not. Harry himself, much less his successors, never pretended supremacy in the Catholic Church diffused over the world."—"The bishops of Rome have alone claimed invariably this supremacy over the whole immense Catholic body, and their title has been most authentically owned and confirmed in all ages," (which is a most impudent falsehood.) "As to his (the king's) being head of his own English church, no Christian or Jew can dispute: and, therefore, we ought most readily to allow that supremacy to all its extent. It is only his grace of Canterbury that has any colour or pretence to

dispute the matter with the monarch, but for us we have none. When the happy day comes that will unite our king and his subjects to the church and faith of his and their pious ancestors, then will we salute him as one of the first sons of that church, and hail him with the glorious title of its true defender, a grander title, in my opinion, than any conferred by Rome on any other monarch, because owning him the supporter of the Christian, Catholic, faithful, and Apostolic Church over the whole world. And who could better discharge that high commission, than he who can send forth at his pleasure invincible English fleets, brave Scottish Highlanders, and valiant Irish hearts of oak, to defend the holy faith over all the globe? Let us, in the meantime, *condescend* in every thing we can, and thus form a political union, which is all that can be expected, or rationally wished for.”—*Orth. Jour.* Sept. 1819.

This writer tells plainly what are the hopes and anticipations of all the Papists in the empire, though they do not all think it expedient to speak so plainly out. He expects that the king of Great Britain and Ireland, and all the people shall be reconciled to Rome. Our happy and free constitution shall then be subverted, and our sovereign converted into an absolute monarch, for he shall then dispose of our fleets and armies “at his pleasure;” and he shall send them forth “to defend the holy faith all over the globe;” that is, to fight the battles of the Pope, and compel all men, at the point of the bayonet and the mouth of the cannon, to submit to the holy See. There will be no need of a parliament then, to give counsel and grant supplies, for the pleasure of the sovereign will be enough to raise money, as well as to direct its expenditure. A council of Jesuits will be placed round the throne; and every thing shall be done according to the good pleasure of the Pope and his college de propaganda. If the subject were not too serious for ridicule, I would say it is truly ludicrous to hear men talk of securing the Established Churches of England and Scotland, and in the same breath to propose to admit into power over them, men who, like the Jesuits, avowedly live for no other object but to promote the cause of the Pope, and to procure the establishment of the Church of Rome upon the ruins of all other churches and states in the world.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXLII.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, MARCH 31st, 1821.  
~~~~~

SINCE the publication of my 139th Number, I have received a letter from Preston, which has a just claim to early insertion, though it should break for a moment the connexion of my subject. In the circular letter of the society, lately formed there, there is a sentence which led me to infer that the curate of the parish had consented to the truce proposed by the Popish priests; and supposing this to be a fact, I made some remarks which bear more heavily upon that reverend gentleman than the case seems to have warranted. I am indebted to Messrs. Walker and Hope for the following correction of that mistake:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

*Preston, March 12th, 1821.*

SIR,

In your Number of March 10th, you have reflected on the conduct of the late curate of this parish, as if he had made a kind of unholy league with the enemies of the Protestant faith. And as a passage in our letter seems to have occasioned your remarks, we wish you to correct this idea. That gentleman had sufficient reasons for suspending his lectures, but he never made peace with Rome. In the extract which you have made from the history of the Jesuits, published in London, in 1816, their influence as it respects the magistrates and clergy of Preston, even at that period, is, we believe, much over-rated; and at the present time we are happy to say, that we have reason to regard our magistrates as

impartial men, and the established clergy as proof against the wily art of Jesuitism. We remain, Sir,

Yours, &c.

W. M. WALKER.

WM. HOPE.

It always gives me pain to think that I have mistaken, or misrepresented any man, or body of men; but the pain in the present instance is more than counterbalanced by the pleasure of being informed, upon good authority, that matters are not so bad as I supposed.

I proceed now to give a view of the moral system of the Jesuits, from their own SECRETA MONITA. The reader will find an account of this work, and how it came into the hands of Protestants, in my first volume, pages 228—231. The Jesuits of the present day will disavow it, though it does not contain one rule which the society has not been known to put in practice, when they had the means and the opportunity. The first chapter regards the manner in which they are to conduct themselves when they begin any new foundation, which contains no small portion of *Jesuitism*. The following is the second, and some other chapters entire:—

CHAP. II.—*In what manner the Society must deport, that they may work themselves into, and after that preserve a familiarity with princes, noblemen, and persons of the greatest distinction.*

1. Princes and persons of distinction every where must by all means be so managed, that we may have their ear, and that will secure their hearts; by which way of proceeding, all persons will become our creatures, and no one will dare to give the society the least disquiet or opposition.

2. That ecclesiastical persons gain a great footing in the favour of princes and noblemen, by winking at their vices, and putting a favourable construction on whatever they do amiss, experience convinces; and this we may observe in their contracting of marriages with their near relations and kindred, or the like. It must be our business to encourage such, whose inclination lies this way, by leading them up in hopes, that through our assistance they may easily obtain a dispensation from the Pope; and no doubt he'll readily grant it, if proper reasons be urged, parallel cases produced, and opinions quoted which countenance such actions, when the common good of mankind, and the greater advancement of God's glory (which are the only end and design of the society,) are pretended to be the sole motives of them.

3. The same must be observed, when the prince happens to engage in any enterprise, which is not equally approved by all his nobility; for in such cases, he must be egged on and excited;

whilst they, on the other hand, must be dissuaded from opposing him, and advised to acquiesce in all his proposals: But this must be done only in *generals*, always avoiding *particulars*, lest on the ill success of the affair, the miscarriage be thrown upon the society. And should ever the action be called in question, care must be taken to have instructions always ready, plainly forbidding it; and these also must be backed by the authority of some senior members, who being wholly ignorant of the matter, must attest upon oath, that such groundless insinuations are a malicious and base imputation on the society.

4. It will also very much further us in gaining the favour of princes, if our members artfully worm themselves, by the interest of others, into honourable embassies to foreign courts in their behalf; but especially to the Pope and great monarchs; for by such opportunities they will be in a capacity both to recommend themselves and their society. To this end, therefore, let none but thorough zealots for our interest, and persons well versed in the schemes and institutions of the society, be ever pitched upon for such purposes.

5. Above all, due care must be taken to curry favour with the minions and domestics of princes and noblemen; whom by small presents, and many offices of piety, we may so far bias, as by means of them to get a faithful intelligence of the bent of their master's humours and inclinations; thus will the society be better qualified to chime in with all their tempers.

6. How much the society has benefited from their engagements in marriage treaties, the houses of Austria, Bourbon, Poland, and other kingdoms, are experimental evidences. Wherefore, let such matches be with prudence picked out, whose parents are our friends, and firmly attached to our interests.

7. Princesses and ladies of quality are easily to be gained by the influence of the women of their bed-chamber; for which reason, we must by all means pay a particular respect to these, for hereby there will be no secrets in the family, but what we shall have fully disclosed to us.

8. In directing the consciences of great men, it must be observed, that our confessors are to follow the opinion of those who allow the greater latitude, in opposition to that of other religious orders; that, their penitents being allured with the prospect of such freedom, may readily relinquish them, and wholly depend upon our direction and counsel.

9. Princes, prelates, and all others who are capable of being signally serviceable to our order, must be favoured so far as to be made partakers of all the merits of the society, after a proper information of the high importance of so great a privilege.

10. Let these notions be cautiously, and with cunning instilled



into the people, that this society is intrusted with a far greater power of absolving, even in the nicest cases ; of dispensing with fasts, with paying and demanding of debts, with impediments of matrimony, and other common matters, than any other religious order ; which insinuations will be of such consequence, that many of necessity must have recourse to us, and thereby lay themselves under the strictest obligations.

11. It will be very proper to give invitations to such to attend our sermons and fellowships, to hear our orations and declamations, as also to compliment them with verses and theses ; to address them in a genteel and complaisant manner, and at proper opportunities to give them some handsome entertainments.

12. Let proper opportunities be used to get knowledge of the animosities that arise among great men, that we may have a finger in reconciling their differences ; for by this means, we shall gradually become acquainted with their friends and secret affairs, and of necessity engage one of the parties in our interests.

13. But should discovery happen to be made, that any person serves either king or prince, who is not well affected towards our society, no stone must be left unturned by our members, or (which is more proper) some other, to induce him by promises, favours, and preferments, ( which must be procured for him under the king or prince,) to entertain a friendship for, and familiarity with us.

14. Let all be very cautious of recommending or preferring such as have been any way dismissed from our society, but especially those who of their own accord have departed from it ; for let them disguise it ever so cunningly, nevertheless they always retain an implacable hatred against our order.

15. Finally, Let all, with such artfulness, gain the ascendant over princes, noblemen, and the magistrates of every place, that they may be ready at our beck, even to sacrifice their nearest relations, and most intimate friends, when we say it is for our interest and advantage.

*CHAP. III.—How the society must behave themselves towards those who are at the helm of affairs, and others who, although they be not rich, are notwithstanding in a capacity of being otherwise serviceable.*

1. All that has been before mentioned, may in a great measure be applied to these ; and we must also be industrious to procure their favour against every one that opposes us.

2. Their authority and wisdom must be courted, for obtaining several offices to be discharged by us ; we must also make a handle of their advice with respect to the contempt of riches ; though at the same time, if their secrecy and faith may be depended on, we may privately make use of their names in amassing temporal goods for the benefit of the society.

3. They must also be employed in calming the minds of the meaner sort of people, and in wheedling the aversions of the populace into an affection for our society.

4. As to bishops, prelates, and other superior ecclesiastics, they must be importuned for such things only as shall appear necessary ; and even for these, with a proper regard to the diversity of our evasions, and the tendency of their inclinations to serve us.

5. In some places it will be sufficient if we can prevail with the prelates and curates, to cause those under them only to bear a reverence to our Order, and that they themselves will be no hinderance to us in the exercise of our ministry. In others, where the clergy are more predominant, as in Germany, Poland, &c. they must be addressed with the profoundest respect, that by their and the prince's authority, monasteries, parishes, priories, patronages, foundations of masses, and religious places may be drawn into our clutches ; and this is no hard matter to be obtained, in those places where Catholics are intermixed with heretics and schismatics. And for the better effecting of this, it will be of great importance to remonstrate to these prelates the prodigious advantage and merit there will be in changes of this sort, which can hardly be expected from priests, seculars, and monks. But should they be prevailed upon, their zeal must then be rewarded with public commendations, and the memory of the action transmitted in writing to latest posterity.

6. In prosecution of the same end, we must engage such prelates to make use of us both for confessors and counsellors ; and if they at any time aim at higher preferment from the see of Rome, their pretensions must be backed with such strong interest of our friends in every place, as we shall be almost sure not to meet with a disappointment.

7. Due care must be also taken by such of our members who have intercourse with bishops and princes, that the society, when these found either colleges, or parochial churches, may always have the power of presenting vicars for the cure of souls ; and that the superintendent of the place for the time being be appointed curate, to the end we may grasp the whole government of the church ; and its parishioners by that means become such vassals to us, that we can ask nothing of them that they will dare to deny us.

8. Wherever the governors of academies hamper our designs, or the Catholics or Heretics oppose us in our foundations, we must endeavour by the prelates to secure the principal pulpits ; for by this means, the society at least may sometime or other have an opportunity of remonstrating their wants and laying open their necessities.

9. The prelates of the church, above all others, must be mightily caressed when the affair of canonization of any of our

members is upon the foot ; and at such a time, letters by all means must be procured from princes and noblemen, by whose interest the matter may be promoted at the court of Rome.

10. If ever it happen that prelates or noblemen are employed in embassies, all caution must be taken to prevent them from using any religious Order that opposes ours, lest their disaffection to us should be infused into their masters, and they propagate it in the provinces and cities where we reside. And if ever ambassadors of this kind pass through provinces or cities, where we have colleges, let them be received with all due marks of honour and esteem, and as handsomely entertained as religious decency can possibly admit of.

*CHAP. IV.—The chief things to be recommended to preachers, and confessors of noblemen.*

1. Let the members of our society direct princes and great men in such a manner, that they may seem to have nothing else in view but the promotion of God's glory ; and advise them to no other austerity of conscience but what they themselves are willing to comply with ; for their aim must not, immediately, but by degrees and insensibly, be directed towards political and secular dominion.

2. We must, therefore, often inculcate into them, that honours and preferments in the state should always be conferred according to the rules of justice ; that God is very much offended at princes when they any wise derogate from this principle, and are hurried away by the impulse of their passions. In the next place, our members must with gravity protest, and in a solemn manner affirm that the administration of public affairs is what they with reluctance interfere in ; and that the duty of their office obliges them often to speak such truths as they would otherwise omit. When this point is once gained, care must be taken to lay before them the several virtues persons should be furnished with, who are to be admitted to public employ ; not forgetting slyly to recommend to them such as are sincere friends to our Order ; but this must be done in such a manner, as not immediately to come from us, (unless the princes enjoin it,) for it may be effected with a far better grace by such as are their favourites and familiars.

3. Wherefore, let the confessors and preachers belonging to our Order, be informed by our friends of persons proper for every office, and above all, of such as are our benefactors ; whose names let them always carefully keep by them, that when proper opportunities occur, they may be palmed upon princes by the dexterity of our members, or their agents.

4. Let the confessors and preachers always remember, with complaisance and a winning address, to sooth princes, and never give them the least offence in their sermons or private conversa-



tions ; to dispossess their minds of all imaginary doubts and fears, and exhort them principally to faith, hope, and political justice.

5. Let them seldom or never accept of small presents for their own private use, but rather recommend the common necessities of the province or college. At home let chambers plainly furnished content them ; and let them not appear in showy dresses, but be ready at every turn to administer their ghostly advice to the meanest person about the place ; lest they give others occasion to believe, they are willing to be helpful to none but the great.

6. Immediately upon the death of any person in post, let them take timely care to get some friend of our society preferred in his room ; but this must be cloaked with such cunning and management, as to avoid giving the least suspicion of our intending to usurp the prince's authority ; for this reason (as has been already said) we ourselves must not appear in it, but make a handle of the artifice of some faithful friends for effecting our designs, whose power may screen them from the envy which otherwise might fall heavier upon the society.

CHAP. V. Prescribes the conduct that must be observed towards such religious persons as are employed in the same ecclesiastical functions with the Jesuits. Chapters VI. and VII. relate to the management of rich widows ; how to keep them from marrying again ; and how to secure their wealth to the society. For the substance of these two chapters, see *THE PROTESTANT*, vol. i. pp. 228—231. As it is not my intention to give the whole system but only a selection of passages, I pass on to

CHAP. VIII.—*How widows' children are to be treated, that they may embrace religion, or a devoted life.*

1. As it will behove the widows to act with resolution, so must we proceed with gentleness on this occasion. Let the mothers be instructed to use their children harshly, even from their cradles, by plying them with reproofs and frequent chastisements, &c. And when their daughters are near grown up to discretion, let them then especially be denied the common dress and ornaments of their sex ; at all times offering up prayers to God, that he would inspire them with a desire of entering into a religious order, and promising them very plentiful portions, on condition they would become nuns : let them lay before them the many inconveniences attending every one in a married state, and those in particular which they themselves have found by woful experience ; often lamenting the great misfortune of their younger years, in not having preferred a single life. And lastly, let them persist to use them in this manner, that their daughters may think of a religious state, being tired of leading such a life with their mothers.

2. Let our members converse familiarly with their sons, and if they seem fit for our turn, introduce them occasionally into the

college, and let every thing be shown with the best face, to invite them to enter themselves of the Order; as the gardens, vineyards, country seats, and villas, where those of our society pass an agreeable life: let them be informed of our travels into several parts of the world, of our familiarity with princes, and whatever else may be agreeable to youth; let them see the outward neatness of our refectories and chambers, the agreeable intercourse we have one with another, the easiness of our rules, which yet has the promise of the glory of God: and lastly, the pre-eminence of our Order above all others; not forgetting, amidst our discourses of piety, to entertain them also with pleasing diverting stories.

3. Let us now and then (as if by divine inspiration) exhort them to religion in general; and then carefully insinuate the perfection and conveniences of our institution above others; and take care to set in a due light, both in public exhortations and private discourses, how heinous a crime it is to resist the immediate call of God; and lastly, let them be soothed to the performance of spiritual exercises, to determine them in the choice of such a state of life.

4. We must also take care to provide for these youths, tutors that are firmly attached to our interests, who must keep a strict eye over them, and continually exhort them to such a course of life; but should they seem reluctant, abridge them of some of their former liberties, that by such restraint they may become conformable. Let their mothers set forth the difficulties which the family labour under; and, if, after all, they cannot be brought of their own accord to desire admission into our society, send them to distant colleges belonging to the Order, under the notion of keeping them closer to their studies; and from their mothers let them receive little countenance, but let our members make use of the most alluring behaviour, that their affections may be brought over to us.

I have not room for another chapter. The tenor of the 9th is, get money, and enrich the society by all possible means; particularly, by inducing persons to bequeath property to them; and by inveigling the heirs and expectants of large estates to join the Order, and become Jesuits, that thereby the estates may fall into the society. I am tired of copying so much disgusting matter as the reader will find in this Number; and I am afraid he will be tired of reading it. It would require about two entire Numbers more to give the whole system; but it is all so like what I have given, that I do not think it necessary to extract much more. I shall introduce my next with a few general remarks on the subject.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXLIH.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, APRIL 7th, 1821.  
~~~~~

IN my last Number, I gave a specimen of *Secreta Monita Societatis Jesu*, "The Secret Instructions of the Jesuits." These secret instructions were not communicated to all the members of the society, but only to persons who had been well tried, and in whom the utmost confidence might be placed. The society had other rules, not so exceptionable, which were put into the hands of her ordinary members; and it was provided, that if ever the "secret instructions," or any part of them, should be divulged to the enemies of the society, or to the world at large, they should be solemnly disclaimed, and denied to be the rules of the society; and those novices who had not been entrusted with the secret, were to be called upon to declare upon oath, that they had never seen such rules, and to produce those which had been put into their hands as the only rules to which they had been required to conform.

To persons unacquainted with the history and character of the Jesuits, the secret instructions will perhaps appear no more than a piece of irony, like Dean Swift's advice to servants, and Dr. Wotherspoon's Ecclesiastical Characteristics; and, indeed, I have a suspicion that both these authors must have been acquainted with *Secreta Monita*, and that they formed their respective works according to the model which it furnished. They, however, were only in jest, while Lainez and Aquaviva were in earnest. The infidelity of many servants, in the view of the one, and the defection of certain ministers in the Church of Scotland from the faith and evangelical practice of their ancestors, in the view of the other



occasioned those exquisite pieces of irony which I have mentioned. But the *Secreta Monita* stands upon higher ground. There is no jesting in it. It is a system of legislation, devised with consummate skill, with a deep knowledge of human nature, calculated and intended to enlist the passions of men and women in the service of that superstitious and idolatrous power that has so long held the human mind in bondage, wherever his authority has been recognised. Besides, the history of Europe, from the time of the institution of the Order, till its suppression, shows that these rules were diligently acted upon. The Jesuits insinuated themselves into the palaces of princes, into the cabinets of ministers of state, and into the families of men of all ranks; and by their sacrament of confession they had access to the heart of every man and woman, from kings and queens down to their butlers and chambermaids: insomuch that nothing of a civil or domestic nature could be carried into effect without their knowing it beforehand, and being able either to frustrate or further it, as it might appear to them to affect the interests of their own Order, or of the Church of Rome at large. When the king of Syria found his movements anticipated, and his plans frustrated once and again by the intelligence which Elisha, by divine inspiration, conveyed to the king of Israel, it is said "the heart of the king of Syria was sore troubled for this thing, and he called his servants, and said unto them, Will ye not show me which of us is for the king of Israel? And one of his servants said, None, my lord, O king, but Elisha, the prophet that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber." 2 Kings vi. 11, 12. Without inspiration, the Jesuits, by means of confession, have been able to do things almost as wonderful, and they have thereby "sore troubled" the heart of many a king and prime minister. According to the first rule of chapter second, princes and persons of distinction every where, were to be so managed, that the Jesuits should have their ear, and that would easily secure their hearts; by which means all persons would become their creatures, and no one would dare to give the society any opposition. This was in effect, taking the government of the world into their own hands. They became spies, not only of men's actions and words, but also of their thoughts and designs, which they communicated to their general at Rome, and which he communicated to his agents wherever he thought the interest of Rome, or an ally of Rome, might be promoted: And thus what was merely passing in the mind of the king of France might have been made known to the king of Spain, before the former had proposed it to his own servants.

The Jesuits carried on their work with so much cunning and address, that they got the ascendancy over great kings before the

latter were aware of it; and kings finding that they were unable to extricate themselves, had no alternative but to submit. They thought it better to flatter the Jesuits than to fight them; and thus Henry IV. of France, notwithstanding their attempts against his life, took them into favour, expecting to find in their gratitude that security which the whole strength of his empire could not afford. He was disappointed, and he fell a sacrifice to his own simplicity: and no better can be expected of any one who shall place confidence in a fraternity so notoriously treacherous, and so unfeeling with regard to every thing that does not affect their own Order.

The following is a short specimen of their intrigues in our own country. After the Reformation had been carried a considerable length in the minority of King James VI., it was in danger of being overthrown by the artifice of the Duke of Lennox, a Papist, and a creature of the French court, who had acquired undue ascendancy over the young king. Through his influence matters were beginning to assume a new appearance; and both the national liberties and the Protestant religion were in the utmost peril. "This change on the court could not fail to alarm the ministers of the church, who had received satisfactory information of the project that was on foot. Their apprehensions were confirmed by the arrival of several Jesuits and seminary priests from abroad, and by the open revolt of some who had hitherto professed the Protestant faith. They accordingly warned their hearers of the danger they apprehended, and pointed at the favourite as an emissary of the house of Guise and of Rome. Lennox, after holding a conference with some of the ministers, declared himself a convert to the Protestant doctrine, and publicly renounced the Popish religion. The jealousy of the nation was revived and inflamed by the interception of letters from Rome, granting a dispensation to the Roman Catholics to *profess the Protestant tenets for a time, provided they preserved an inward attachment to the ancient faith, and embraced every opportunity of advancing it in secret*. This discovery was the immediate occasion of that memorable transaction, the swearing of the national covenant."—*M'Crie's Life of Melville*, vol. i. p. 262.

Passing over their more public delinquencies, I shall advert shortly to the unspeakable misery which the Jesuits, according to their own rules, inflict upon private families. One of the first things which they endeavour to accomplish in a family, is to corrupt the servants, and gain them over to their interest. If they cannot be so gained, something against them must be insinuated into the minds of their mistresses, that they may be dismissed; then the Jesuit confessor has a parcel of his own creatures ready to be recommended to fill their places, who, of course, become his spies, and inform him of all that they see and hear in the family.

Confession gives a Jesuit the complete command of every family, and binds every individual in it to do just what he is pleased to dictate.—*See Secreta Monita, chap. VI.*

But what is still worse than the corrupting of servants, and retaining them as their spies in every family, the Jesuits teach mothers, especially those who are widows, to make the lives of their daughters miserable, in order that they may become *religious*; that is become nuns, and throw themselves into the arms of the *holy* fathers, in the hope of finding that happiness which they cannot find at home. The mothers themselves have scarcely a choice in this matter. They must do as their ghostly confessors bid them, else they shall be subjected to such penances as will make their own lives miserable. Thus a worse than Egyptian bondage is inflicted on all who submit to the insidious interference and influence of the society of Jesus.

The fiend-like cruelty of the Jesuits is no less manifest in the measures which they take for entrapping young men into the service of their Order. In the 8th rule of the 9th chapter, relating to the children of rich parents, we have the following directions:—“ If they have sons who are fit for our turn, let them be allured to us, and the others, (that is the daughters) be enticed by the promise of small rewards, to enter themselves of different Orders. But should there be an only son, let no means be omitted for the bringing him over to the society, *and freeing him from all fear of his parents*; let him be persuaded it is a call from above; and shown how acceptable a sacrifice it would be to God, *should he desert his parents without their knowledge or consent*; if this be effected, let him enter his novitiate in a remote college, having first given information to the general. But if they happen to have both sons and daughters, let the daughters be first disposed of in a nunnery; and afterwards let the sons be drawn into the society, when they are got into possession of their sisters’ effects.”

It was the practice of the society to allure young men of genteel appearance, and superior genius, into their Order. They accomplished this by showing them what a happy life the members of the society led. Notwithstanding their vow of poverty, they were wallowing in wealth, and enjoying all the luxuries which wealth could procure. Besides, they were not very strict in restraining the vices of youth. Theirs was what has been called “ easy virtue.” They would allow the most ample indulgence to youthful passions, provided a decent appearance was preserved, but especially provided the young men would implicitly submit to the rules of the Order, and become the devoted slaves of the Pope. Thousands were allured by these means; and from the circumstance of selecting young men of superior genius and appearance, the Order of Jesuits came to rise above all that had been instituted before it.



But miserable was the case of every young man who had been induced to profess himself of the Order, even in its lowest degrees, who afterwards repented of the step he had taken, and wished to return to his friends ; and miserable was also the case of him, who, upon trial, was found too simple and honest ; or not acute enough to serve the purposes of the society. Such persons were dismissed ; and all the Jesuits in the kingdom where they resided were instructed to discountenance them ; and to whisper about, either that they had been detected in crimes, or had divulged such things of themselves in confession, that it was not consistent with the interest and reputation of the society to retain them. Thus a mark was set upon them, which would remain to the last day of their lives ; and they became an excommunicated *cast*, not for any fault in them, but because they were not villains enough to be Jesuits.

“ Since those that are dismissed (says *Secreta Monita*, chap. xi.) do frequently very much prejudice the society, by divulging such secrets as they have been privy to ; their attempts must, therefore, be obviated in the following manner. Let them be prevailed upon, before they are dismissed, to give it under their hands, and swear, that they never will directly or indirectly, either write or speak any thing to the disadvantage of the Order ; and let the superiors keep upon record, the evil inclinations, failings, and vices, which they, according to the custom of the society, for the discharge of their consciences formerly confessed : this, if ever they give us occasion, may be produced by the society, to the nobility and prelates, as a very good handle to prevent their promotion.

“ Let it be immediately published through all our colleges, that such and such are dismissed ; and let the general causes of their expulsion (such as an unmortified mind, disobedience, disaffection to spiritual exercises, an obstinate adherence to their own opinion, &c.) be highly aggravated. In the next place, let all be advised to keep no correspondence with them upon any account whatsoever. And if strangers should happen to make any mention of them, let all our members unanimously affirm, in every public place, that the society expels none without weighty causes, spewing out as the sea, all its dead carcasses, &c., and let such causes also be artfully insinuated, which have occasioned us any ill-will, that their ejection may appear to the world with a more commendable grace. In private exhortations, at people’s houses, let these be represented as persons very turbulent, and continually importuning a readmission into the society. And let their sad fate be industriously aggravated, who, after exclusion, have happened to come to an untimely or miserable end.” Again, “ Let the society, by all manner of obligations, endeavour to prevail upon the noblemen and prelates, with whom the dismissed may have

any credit or authority, to deny them their countenance ; and let it be shown that the common good of an Order, which is as famous as it is useful to the church, should always be preferred to the private advantage of any particular person whatsoever."

Thus, if a young man has once consented to put his neck under the Jesuits' yoke, there is no possibility of his ever obtaining deliverance in this world. He will be deprived of all the privileges and honours of the society when they are pleased to expel him, or when he is pleased to leave them ; but he shall not be able to withdraw himself from the sphere of their malignant influence. He shall be the object of unceasing and unrelenting persecution ; and every man who shall seem disposed to befriend him, will have his ear filled with stories to his prejudice, so that he shall be left to perish in misery and contempt ; and then the Jesuits will triumph in his death as the judgment of God against him, and hold up his case as a warning to all others. It would be less cruel, and if possible less diabolical, if they would murder in cold blood, those young men whom they find upon trial unfit for their purpose, than thus to torture them to death by their malignant calumnies.

Every attempt of a Jesuit to make himself familiar to Protestants ought to be repelled at the very first. The approaches of the Order are like the temptations of sin ; at first promising and flattering ; and not presenting any thing *very* evil or *very* dangerous ; but when they have obtained the smallest compliance, they effect a lodgment in the soul, and obtain a command over the body, from which human power cannot grant deliverance. The first chapter of "*Secreta Monita*" begins thus :—"It will be of great importance, for the rendering our members agreeable to the inhabitants of a place where they design their settlement, to set forth the end of the society, in the manner prescribed by our statutes, which lay down, that the society ought as diligently to seek occasions of doing good to others as to themselves ; wherefore, let them with humanity discharge the meanest offices in the hospitals, frequently visit the sick, the poor, and the prisoners, and readily and indifferently take the confession of all, that the novelty of such uncommon and diffusive charity, may excite in the *principal inhabitants an admiration of our conduct, and forcibly draw them into an affection for us.*"

The reader will perceive the "cloven foot" at the conclusion of this rule, but it is still more apparent in the 5th and 7th of the same chapter. "At their first settlement, let our members be cautious of purchasing lands ; but if they happen to buy such as are well situated, let this be done in the name of some faithful and trusty friend : And that our poverty may have the more colourable gloss of reality, let the purchases adjacent to the places wherein our colleges are founded, be assigned by the provincial to colleges

at a distance ; by which means, it will be impossible that princes and magistrates can ever attain a certain knowledge of what our revenues amount to."—" Let the greatest sums be always extorted from widows, by frequent remonstrances of our extreme necessities."

By the apparent humility and charity above recommended, the Jesuits deceive the simple, and work their way into the good opinion of many respectable Protestants. Nay, though gold be one of their chief idols, they will sometimes be at a little expense to commend themselves and their religion to persons in office, or those connected with them. One of the Order who had recently settled in a certain town, went one day to a gentleman, and presenting him with half-a-crown told him, it was his property. On being asked how that happened ? he received for answer, "ask no questions, I am the Catholic priest ; this money is yours, and it is my duty to restore it to you." It was of course to be inferred that he had discovered by confession, that a servant had defrauded his master to that amount ; and as might have been expected the circumstance left upon the gentleman's mind a favourable impression of both the priest and his religion. Happily the love of money prevented the trick from being practised to any great extent ; else for a few pounds the priest might have purchased the good opinion of all the chief men of the place. That it was a mere trick I am convinced from the rarity of the thing, in a place where Papists are known to form a very large proportion of the thieves. If the priests were able and willing to enforce the duty of restitution, we should hear of instances every day ; but the fact is, after all the attention I have paid to the character and the conduct of Popish priests, I have heard of only two instances besides the one above related :—One was an offer of twenty pence to a gentleman in such terms as the above, which, however, he declined accepting, and desired the priest to give it to the poor. Sometime after, the same priest brought him ten shillings, which no doubt alarmed him with regard to the character of his servants, and not knowing the extent to which they might be robbing him, he took the money, which, it is supposed, was a disappointment to the priest, for he came to him no more.

I shall conclude this subject with the " Oath of Secrecy devised by the Roman clergy, as it remaineth on record at Paris, among the Society of Jesus." It is inserted in "Foxes and Firebrands," from a collection of papers by Archbishop Usher.

#### THE OATH OF SECRECY.

I, A. B. now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael, the Archangel, the blessed St.



John Baptist, the Holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the Saints and Sacred Host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his holiness Pope Urban is Christ's vicar-general, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal, without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed: therefore to the utmost of my power I shall and will defend this doctrine, and his holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical (or Protestant) authority whatsoever: especially against the now pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother-church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state, named Protestants, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare, that the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Hugonots, and of other of the name Protestants, to be damnable, and they themselves are damned, and to be damned, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist, and advise all, or any of his holiness' agents in any place, wherever I shall be, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom, I shall come to; and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical for the propagating of the mother-church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agent's counsels from time to time, as they intrust me, and not to divulge directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance, whatsoever; but to execute all what shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred convent. All which I, A. B. do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed Sacrament, which I now am to receive, to perform, and on my part to keep inviolably: And do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions, to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the Eucharist; and witness the same further with my hand and seal in the face of this holy convent this day of

An. Dom. &c.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXLIV.

~~~~~  
*SATURDAY, APRIL 14th, 1821.*  
~~~~~

HAVING finished what I had to say about the Jesuits, I shall take the opportunity of a pause, or break in the thread of my discussion, to say a few words to some correspondents, who wish to know if I intend at this time to take up the subject of what is called "Catholic emancipation." My friends will be satisfied when I inform them, that it is not lawful in such a work as mine to discuss matters pending in parliament, or indeed any topic of a purely political nature. The late Act relating to cheap periodical publications, lays me under the necessity of keeping within the circle which I prescribed to myself at first; that of exposing the errors of Popery as a religious system, and of showing how these errors tend to the ruin of the souls and bodies of individuals, and to the great injury of civil society, when men holding them have power in their hands.

To such of my readers as have access to the Morning Post London Newspaper, I strongly recommend a series of letters under the signature of PHILOPATRIS, as perfectly conclusive and unanswerable on the subject of my correspondents' inquiry. I think the author would render essential service to his country by publishing them in a cheap form, that they might be extensively circulated. In the Morning Post, there is also in course of publication, a series of letters addressed to Mr. Wilberforce, well worthy of attention. And in the number of that Paper for the 30th of last month, there is a powerful letter by the Reverend Sir Harcourt Lees, Bart. a gentleman who has written more against Popery within the last eighteen months, than almost all his brethren.

together. I have been informed that his exertions have had a powerful effect in convincing the Protestants in Ireland of the very great danger to their own safety, that will result from the admission of Papists to authority over them, and even some of the priests have felt the power of his pen ; one young gentleman, in particular, who was preparing for orders, has abandoned his purpose, and avowed in a letter to Sir H. which is printed in *The Religious Retrospect*, attached to the *Antijacobin Review*, for Nov. last, that he has convinced him of the errors of Popery. One thing is certain, we hear nothing *now* of Irish Protestants petitioning to have their enemies set over them, which was common enough of late years ; and the change is said to be owing in a great measure to this gentleman's labours.

I have of late received a good deal of information from Ireland, with respect to the practices of Papists in that kingdom. One gentleman writes me as follows :

“ SIR,

“ I concluded my former Letter\* with an affecting, but well authenticated account of one of the numberless instances of those stratagems resorted to by Priests and Papists in Ireland, for the purpose of supporting the tottering fabric of Popery ; and it is astonishing what effect the pretended conversions of Protestants have upon the minds of that community. Many objects are hereby gained by its votaries : the estimation of that religion, which, as they pretend so many Protestants embrace, is enhanced, and considered the exclusive one ; and it cuts off the inquiring or the wavering from any idea of examining into the principles of the reformed religion, which they are assured by their priests, will not bear the test of a death-bed ; and thereby giving them an unlimited ascendancy over the purses and consciences of their flocks. To gain these desirable objects, every engine is set to work, and every device practised. Of many take the following :—

“ The priests call at the houses of the better description of sick Protestants, in country places, apparently to inquire after their health. This has all the appearance of good nature ; but their real object is to make their flocks believe that they have been sent for by the sick ; and as the wisdom of our forefathers, knowing the proselyting system of Popery, enacted a law, enforced by a penalty, to prevent Roman Catholic Priests from visiting sick or dying Protestants, unless sent for by a Protestant messenger over the age of 16 years ; the priest says that the circumstance must be kept secret, but that the sick person has died in the Catholic faith (as they call their profession.) A case of this nature lately occurred in my neighbourhood, when it was asserted by a priest, that a Protestant

\* See PROZ. No. CXXXV.



*Clergyman* on his death-bed had sent for him, and had changed his religion. The priest being charged with this report, refused to give any satisfaction, until two Protestant attendants proved upon oath, that the priest only called to inquire after the man's health, and never opened his lips on the subject of religion. Indeed, this practice is so general in country towns and country places, that contrary to the acknowledged hospitality of the Irish, the writer has known of many instances where directions were given, not to admit a priest inside the doors if he should call. Nurse-tenders also are instructed to countenance these practices by admitting the priest at night into the house, and if possible to the sick. In a case of this kind which came under my own observation, a Roman Catholic gentleman of my acquaintance, and a relative of a Protestant lady who was sick, was so indignant, that he declared that he himself should be the first to prosecute the priest, if he persisted to persevere in such unworthy schemes of clandestine interference.

"A Protestant, a man in comfortable circumstances, had married a Roman Catholic, (a custom too prevalent in Ireland, and encouraged by the priests;) the sons went to church, the daughter to mass. The writer has been assured by the sons themselves, that they were obliged to watch their dying father, to prevent the introduction of a priest which the man detested; and when every attempt made by the daughter proved abortive to prevail on the dying man to have a priest sent for, she left him in a rage, *to die and be damned!* One of the fraternity having spitefully assured him, that unless he sent for the priest, he should not be buried near his wife, (who was dead,) the dying man mildly replied, 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.'

"The Roman Catholics, Sir, complain of persecution on account of their religion; but is it not a most grievous persecution which they thus carry on by every means *at present* in their power against the poor dying Protestants? Surely a tyrant would allow his dying enemy to die in peace; but this privilege is not allowed to many Protestants who detest Popery. What, Sir, may we expect from men of like principles with increased power? or what may be expected from a people where Popery is predominant? No longer should we find them privately plotting the advancement of their religion by persuasives, or even by threats of *future* punishment—we should again see present and temporal, not future and spiritual punishment applied—we should again see Smithfield in a blaze.

"I have frequently charged some of the better description of Roman Catholics with believing that the priest has power to forgive sin; but this they have denied, although they allowed that the poor and ignorant of their profession thought so, but they acknowledged that they believed that the priest had power to forgive the sins of a dying person being confessed and anointed; this they

call being *prepared* ! which still brings us to the same conclusion, that they are made to believe that it rests with the priest whether any person shall go to heaven or to hell. Indeed, that this is the opinion of Roman Catholics is most evident ; because they will not allow a Roman Catholic, at least, to be buried in consecrated ground in country places, who has not been *prepared* by the priest. Many instances could be adduced of their coffins being thrown by night out of their graves, and even over the walls. Their enmity, instigated by their priests, is particularly excited against the bodies of those Roman Catholics who had renounced Popery, to deter the living from following their example. In cases of this nature, Protestant Clergymen have been prevented from reading the burial service, and more than once knocked down.

“ The last ceremony to be performed by the priest to the dying after confession and the sacrament, is the application of what they call the consecrated oil to particular parts of the body ; after which the person is not on any account to speak one word, otherwise the entire ceremony must be gone through again ; in this stage the person is said to be *prepared*.

“ A man formerly in my employment of dissipated morals, having been considered in a dying state, the priest was sent for, who, a short time after informed me, that he had *prepared* him. He also told the persons about the sick man, that he was now *as free from sin* as the child new born ; and that he would soon as certainly be in heaven. Unfortunately for the priest’s prediction, the man recovered, but has not since evidenced the least change for the better in his religious or moral conduct.

“ Whatever pretended sanctity may be thought to reside in the use of this holy oil, as well as in other Popish ceremonies of even higher supposed sanctity, I am convinced that many of the better informed Roman Catholics, as well as many of the priests, are not so well satisfied with their efficacy as to place unlimited confidence in them : in general you will find that Roman Catholics of liberal education, look with indifference upon those things so highly valued by the commonalty. I have heard several express perfect indifference, bordering upon contempt, in speaking of them, and I shall hereafter show that some of the priests themselves are of the same way of thinking, whatever they may pretend to the contrary.

“ We are told that a drowning man will grasp at a straw, and it is thus that many Roman Catholics, convinced that all is not right in the sight of God, laying hold on the promises and performances of the priest, go down to the grave with a lie in their right hand ; but if perchance, these straws of Popery are not thought sufficient to bear up the mind of the dying Papist, to believe that he can safely depend upon them, and he requires some legitimate proofs of their efficiency ; the priest will either not condescend to give him

any, or refer him to the legends of the saints and the infallibility of the church.

“A young gentleman, a Roman Catholic of my acquaintance, while studying physic, was attacked by a pulmonary complaint, which brought on consumption. His attendance at chapel while in health was very regular, and he passed for a moral and religious young man. As his complaint gained ground, it became necessary for him to examine the grounds of his dependance for future happiness or misery, and he then found that his attendance at chapel was merely from habit, not conviction; he feared to trust to the mere ceremonial of a religion, which he saw had more of show than substance in it; I found him, on visiting, in a state of great unhappiness of mind, and on asking him whether his priests could not give him any ease? he said, ‘Ah no! they are extremely ignorant, they indeed promise great things, but they cannot convince my judgment; they cannot support their promises by any legitimate proofs, that they are well founded;’ he then begged I would give him my opinion on this subject. In fact, I found that this young gentleman had, in consequence of seeing through the tinsel ceremonies of Popery and the conduct of the priests, become an infidel. He first doubted the system of Popery to be the way of salvation held out to guilty man, and from thence he declined by a natural gradation into a disbelief of all revealed religion. Under these circumstances I saw it was necessary first to convince him from the Bible, that there was a religion revealed, and next to open or reveal the way of salvation as contained in that revelation. On requesting to see a Bible, (though the family were considered highly respectable,) they assured me they never had such a thing! and on inquiring whether one of their Bibles could not be procured, they told me they did not know, but *perhaps* the priest might have one. I did not however send. Sufficient for me here to observe, that by arguments drawn from the prophets, this young gentleman was convinced that they all wrote of Christ, and therefore, that they must have been divinely inspired; consequently that Jesus was the great sacrifice for sin, and the *only* intercessor for guilty man, when applied by the Holy Spirit and received as the gift of God, by faith.

“The wisdom of our forefathers having a more *experimental* knowledge of the intolerant spirit of Popery, had fenced the vine of the reformation by guards and fences, to prevent the wild beast in the Apocalypse from breaking down the hedges and devouring its tender branches. A law had been enacted to prevent the public processions of the Host, and of the images of saints in these kingdoms: this was not only a just enactment to suppress an open display of idolatry, but also a wise measure to defend his Majesty’s loyal subjects from insults and injuries to their persons. However, of late years, the Paists have revived these processions in



Ireland, and we have now a yearly display of the ceremony of bearing the Host in public procession with all the glitter and paraphernalia of a sumptuous canopy, with gorgeous plumes and incense; priests, nuns, friars, monks, all in their costumes; and every thing else that is calculated to arrest the attention of admiring crowds and prostrate devotees: it is true that these ceremonies are, *at present*, carried round the chapel yards; but in country places, many of these yards are not enclosed, and border the public roads; so that the traveller or curious stranger is in danger of being insulted and knocked down, unless he take off his hat in obeisance to the idol. I have known several instances of insults offered, and injuries sustained on these occasions, by Protestants, who justly conceived that taking off the hat was an act of adoration, and I have also known many Protestants, to their shame I speak it, who, to gratify an idle curiosity, have conformed to the dictates of these devotees, by thus worshipping the idol which they had set up. The Papists take particular notice of Protestants who attend to see these ceremonies, and they are instructed to believe that such are favourably inclined to Popery in their hearts. We may soon therefore expect that, with an extension of Roman Catholic privileges, their circuits of procession will be extended also through our streets and cities, when every person who shall not prostrate himself to the Host, will be laid prostrate by the club of a fanatic. I am not now stating a theory or an idle fancy, I have my eye on some countries in Europe, where Popery is predominant, and where the statements I have made have really occurred.

“On these days of procession, the parish priest invites the assistant priests and his acquaintances to a sumptuous entertainment prepared at his house. The writer, some years ago, dined with them more than once on these days, and he can bear testimony, that every rarity to gratify the palate had been provided, even from a distance of several miles round; with the best wines that could be procured. One of these days falling upon a Friday, which is called a *fast* day, he has counted *eleven* different kinds of the best fish dressed in every possible way, with pies, puddings, peaches, grapes, &c. &c. A curious incident occurred on one of these occasions: the company having assembled in the priest's drawing room, were coming down a dark staircase to dinner; when one of the priests pinched the writer, (who being dressed in black he mistook for a priest,) and whispered, that *this was the best procession*, to which I answered, ‘I thought so too.’ My intelligent neighbour finding his mistake, pushed through the crowd to conceal himself.

“I said that many of the priests do not believe the efficacy imputed by them to many things counted holy. Surely the above anecdote speaks a volume in confirmation of this assertion, and as

I myself was the person, there can be no mistake in it. Now, Sir, if one of the highest, if not the highest mystery, as I believe they call these things, can be so disrespectfully spoken of by a priest, what must they think of those other mysteries counted less sacred. If it be said that this was the language or opinion of an individual priest, I admit it; but surely we must draw a fair deduction from the thing itself, that he would be afraid to speak in this way, if he did not know that other priests held these things in the same contempt. Why, therefore, it may be asked, do the priests countenance and support such rites and ceremonies? The answer is obvious, they are a means for keeping the people satisfied with a religion, which presents them with such finery and shows, and of bringing a good deal of money into the priests' coffers. The late Sir Richard Musgrave, Bart. who wrote a history of the last Irish Rebellion, assured me, that he has frequently seen priests take the wafers from their pixes, (boxes to hold what they call the consecrated wafer or Host) and seal their letters with them. If they believe in transubstantiation, they must believe that each wafer contains, nay, is the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and nothing but the greatest scepticism to their avowed or professed opinions, could induce them to apply this consecrated Host to such profane uses.

“To such a system of religion and to their priests, may we not by application address the following quotation from Acts xix. 24 to 28 inclusive:—‘For a certain man, named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain unto the craftsmen; whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth: moreover, ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which are made with hands; so that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought; but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth. And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.’”

“J. A.”

The following is from the same writer:—

“SIR,

“The Scriptures say, there is but one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; no, says the Papist, there are many more: there is the Virgin, and the Virgin's reputed mother in chief; and there are a host of inferior intercessors in the saints, whose stock of merit beyond their own wants, form an inexhaustible fund, to draw on to supply the want of it in the Church; and indeed, if we could suppose such a stock of merit belonging to the

saints to exist, it must be inexhaustible, if it were not expended long since. Papists very wisely fearing the capability of this reservoir to hold out, are daily adding to it by other means. In many parishes in Ireland, there are one or more old men or women, (if old maids so much the better,) whose pretensions to sanctity stand very high in the estimation of their more ignorant neighbours, and as it is believed that they daily repeat more rosaries than are required for their own salvation, they are supposed to have a pretty large stock of this article to spare, which they are at liberty to barter to the most advantage with their less industrious neighbours for things of more immediate consumption. I have known an old maid of this celebrity, draw so largely on her grocer in this way, by way of barter, that he was obliged at last to close his account with her. The merit of these persons' prayers is considered to be so highly valued in heaven, by many of the ignorant Papists, that they think it would be a kind of injustice to refuse their petitions; consequently, they are frequently employed to pray for the recovery of the sick, or for success in any business, and if the event should prove propitious, these saints claim with the merit, a correspondent gratuity.

"I understand, that by some regulation of the Vatican, no persons can be now *sainted* by the Pope, until a century after their decease, and unless some well attested miracle can be adduced to prove their claim to such high pre-eminence; this prevents the scandal which would otherwise attach itself to the appointment of persons to this high favour, before old time has sunk their frailties and their vices into oblivion; but as the friends of a reputed saint cannot get them an immediate appointment on the Pope's list, they perform their part in providing the necessary credentials, by the attestation of some miracles performed by the candidate saints to entitle their names to be placed on the Pope's *Cadet* list for future preferment. So much sanctity was said to reside in a parish priest who died a few years ago in my neighbourhood, (of whom it was industriously circulated, that several miraculous cures were wrought, that at least 10,000 persons daily for a month frequented his grave; and as fast as the clay could be thrown upon his coffin, it was sold out in bits to the eager multitudes, until all their wants were supplied."

I find I have not room here for the sequel of this letter, but I may find room for it in a future Number. Every account which I receive from Ireland, confirms what I have endeavoured to prove, that Popery continues in that country to exhibit all the grossness of the dark ages, of which I hope to adduce more evidence before I have done.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXLV.

---

SATURDAY, APRIL 21st, 1821.

---

HAVING procured a copy of Berington and Kirk's work, as noticed at the conclusion of my 139th Number, it will be expected, after what I said of it, that I should inform my readers what sort of a work it is; and, indeed, it is by no means so formidable as I was led to expect from the account which I had got of it. I judged from its title that it would be easy to refute it, but this I find was not correctly given by the writer whose account of it I inserted in Number 138. It should have been, "The faith of Catholics *confirmed* by Scripture, and *attested* by the fathers of the five first centuries of the church." My opponents however gain nothing by the correction: for this title is every whit as objectionable as the incorrect one. The meaning of the word *confirm*, according to Johnson, is, 1. "To put past doubt by new evidence—2. To settle; to establish—3. To fix; to radicate—4. To complete; to perfect—5. To strengthen by new solemnities or ties." The first is most applicable to the case in hand;—"to put past doubt by new evidence." This supposes that "the faith of Catholics" is originally derived from some other source than the Bible; and that the Bible is no better than a corroborating witness relating to something which they know without it, and independently of it. This inference is perfectly legitimate; but the authors have very candidly given me the advantage of an explicit avowal, that they conceive the Scriptures "to be of no use, as an *independent* rule of faith, for this plain reason: That as all the truths which we believe to be divine, and which are the objects of our faith, came immediately from Christ, and were taught by the apostles, before those Scriptures (of the N. T.) were written—we are not at liberty to think that those truths would not have remained, to the end of the world, pure and unadulterated, had that primitive state of things continued; that is, had it never seemed good to any of those apostolic men, as it did to St. Luke, to commit to writing what they had learned."

*Intro. p. xiv.* Again: "Hence we lay it down as an introductory and certain principle; that all that, and that only, is of Catholic faith, which God has revealed, AND the church proposes to our belief.—'The Catholic Christian,' observes the learned bishop of Meaux, 'forms not his faith by reading the Scriptures; his faith is already formed before he begins to read; reading serves

only to *confirm* what he before believed ; that is, to confirm the doctrine which the church had delivered to him." *Ibid.* p. xxi.

Thus it is plainly avowed by modern Papists, that the Bible is with them of no authority by itself. I consider the simple statement of this fact enough for my present purpose ; and I hope it will satisfy every one who really believes and understands his Bible, that Papists are not Christians, and that they cannot be reasoned with as such. The primary, or more properly speaking, the *only foundation* of their faith is the testimony of the church : and what is this church ? it is the Pope of Rome with his army of priests—nothing else. It is a body of men, who, for hundreds of years, have been notorious for all the vices by which men can possibly degrade themselves. What is called *Church History* groans under the load of filth and abomination, which attaches to the character of the head of this church ; namely, the Pope of Rome ; and like the head have been the members. To deny this would be to set aside the evidence of all history ; and no man will deny it, who is not prepared, if occasion require, to call good evil, and evil good. It is needless to tell me that the present Pope is a sober man, and that many of the priests of the present age are men of decent and sober lives. The light of the Reformation has forced them into this state in spite of the demoralizing tendency of their system ; but Berington and Kirk, and all genuine Papists, believe that the doctrine of Christ has descended to them uncorrupted through all the Popes and priests of the dark ages, though they were men whose mouth was an open sepulchre, under whose tongue was the poison of asps, and in whose ways were destruction and misery.

I beg leave to ask our Glasgow Papists, if they would consider the profligate inmates of the stews in the most depraved and polluted lanes of our city, as infallible judges and teachers of what is pure in morals, and amiable in domestic life ? If they say they would not, then I say, they ought not to receive the testimony or teaching of their clergy with regard to Christianity, which is a system of perfect holiness. It is not possible that such men could teach it in sincerity ; for though bad men may sometimes be found to speak sound doctrine where the contrary would be detected and condemned, men so profligate and abandoned as the Popish priests generally were before the Reformation, and under no restraint from men better informed than themselves, would feel compelled to teach corrupt doctrine as an apology for their impure lives.

I know that it will be replied, that the promise of Christ to be with the apostles and their successors to the end of the world, secures the clergy against teaching false doctrine, whatever their lives may be ; that having received *holy orders*, they are, *ex officio*, infallible ; and therefore are not to be put upon a footing with the heroes and heroines of our Saltmarket, who, though they be

equally innocent, have not received the unction which the priests have received, and by which they are incapable of error. In reply, it is enough to tell Papists that this is a mere fancy of their own, without the shadow of countenance from any thing that Christ and his apostles taught. The apostles themselves had no security against falling into error ; but that which was connected with their personally abiding in Christ. It is admitted that they had extraordinary gifts as men divinely inspired ; and therefore they were miraculously preserved from falling into error, either in preaching or writing. This cannot be said of the ordinary ministers of the church who lived after them ; and they have therefore no right to call themselves successors of the apostles, seeing they do not possess those endowments which were imparted to inspired men, and to none else. But even apostles would not have been credible teachers of Christianity, or preachers of the gospel, if their own lives had not exhibited the influence of the gospel in some measure of purity, and obedience to the law of God. Christ told them plainly, John xv. 2—8. that in order to their fruitfulness, it was necessary that they should abide with him, and he in them. Ye are clean, (says he) through the word which I have spoken unto you ; that is, they were holy persons ; they were born of the incorruptible seed of the word ; and it was necessary that they should continue holy, and in personal union with Him who is the fountain of holiness, and the pattern of it, otherwise they would remain unfruitful, not only in their personal state and character, but also as labourers in the Lord's vineyard. I do not say that the word of God may not be spoken by men who are not savingly united to Christ, or that God in sovereignty may not bless his own word spoken by men of impure heart ; but I do say, that there is not a promise in the whole Bible to such persons—not a word that can encourage them to hope that they shall be kept from error, or that their teaching shall be profitable, or tend to the salvation of any soul. “Unto the wicked the Lord saith, What hast *thou* to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldst take my covenant in thy mouth ? seeing thou hatest instruction, and castest my words behind thee. When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers. Thou givest thy mouth to evil, and thy tongue frameth deceit.” Psal. l. 16—19.

Here, by the pen of the Psalmist, the Holy Spirit has drawn the very character which the Popish priests have exhibited for hundreds of years,—from the very time that the Church of Rome began to give heed to seducing spirits ; from that time they have been unceasingly employed in building up and upholding, by all deceiveableness of unrighteousness, a system of fraud, imposition, will-worship, superstition, and idolatry. These are the men who give themselves out as the depositaries of the pure doctrines of



Jesus Christ, and who boast that they would have kept them pure and uncorrupted through all ages, though the New Testament had not been written ! No wise man would make an unclean vessel the depository of that which he wished to keep clean ; and it would be blasphemy to suppose any such thing to have been done by Jesus Christ. As well may we suppose him to have intrusted the keeping and transmission of his word to the devil himself, whose kingdom is to be destroyed by it, as to his active agents, whose own wicked lives compelled them to conceal what condemned them.

I might very honourably leave Berington and Kirk's work here, as condemned by its own title, and their admission that they do not derive their faith from the Bible, but use the Bible only as a secondary authority to *confirm* what they have received by tradition, through the medium of men as ignorant, and, I suppose, a great deal more wicked than themselves.

I think it worth while, however, to give a more particular account of this work, especially as it is understood to be a masterpiece of its kind, and to be quite unanswerable : And I confess, that if it were necessary to scrutinize the immense heap of matter brought together from the canons of councils and the writings of fathers, many of whom most Protestants never heard of before ; if it were necessary to ascertain the degree of credit due to all these men, and whether the works ascribed to them were genuine, and truly translated, it would be a work which few men would choose to undertake. But my readers know that I admit no writing, later than those of the apostle John, to be of authority in matters of religion ; and thus I reduce ninety-nine hundredth parts of the great volume, of 500 pages, to a dead letter.\* The arguments which profess to be drawn from the Bible, are such as a child may answer ; and it is not necessary that I give any more than a specimen.

Before going into detail, however, it is right to remark, that notwithstanding the boasted certainty with which the Church of Rome teaches the true faith, without any mixture of error or mistake, my authors declare themselves not sure whether they have given the true "faith of Catholics" correctly or not. To the work they prefix the following DECLARATION. "As the sole design of the following compilation is to aid the instruction, and to strengthen the faith, of the Catholics of this united kingdom ; and as inaccuracies, in the wording of the propositions ; in translating so many various passages ; and in stating some opinions, notwithstanding our utmost care, may have escaped us, we submit, without reserve, the work in all its parts, to the judgment

\* I have given my reasons for rejecting the authority of the fathers in some former Numbers, particularly in my replies to Juvenis, (See Number 132.) so that I need not go over the ground again.

and correction of our ecclesiastical superiors, and the other pastors of the church, who are the appointed guardians of her faith and discipline.

October 2, 1812.

"JOSEPH BERINGTON.

"JOHN KIRK."

The danger of mistaking the meaning of the Bible, when read by common people, forms the leading subject of a long Introduction; but what do the readers of this work gain, in point of security, from mistake, when the authors are not certain whether they understand their own meaning, or whether they have expressed it intelligibly? They submit to their ecclesiastical superiors whether or not they have written properly; and if these said superiors should condemn their propositions, they must confess their error whether they are convinced of it or not. In point of fact, Bishop Poynter, Vicar Apostolic of the London district, has pointed out a number of inaccuracies, which Mr. Berington explains and palliates as well as he can, in a letter addressed to this, his superior—"in order," he says, "to remove or lessen difficulties, not to excuse inaccuracies, or to controvert objections." In the Church of Rome, to enter into controversy, or differ in opinion from a superior, is out of the question. An ordinary priest must never presume to know what is of faith, so well as a bishop; no bishop must presume to know it so well as his metropolitan; and no metropolitan dares to know it so well as the Pope. In this church, therefore, the body of the people can know nothing at all with certainty, for few of them have personal access to the head, who alone is not responsible to a superior, and who has power to dictate to inferiors whatever he pleases, as articles of faith. Yet Papists are continually boasting that theirs is the only Church in which the true faith is declared with *infallible certainty*! This is almost as great an absurdity as transubstantiation; and only he who believes the one is able to believe the other.

Professing to lay down and prove at length only those points which distinguish the church of Rome from other churches, my authors scarcely touch the doctrine of the Trinity, the atonement, and some more which they say are held in common with them, and others: but those men do not believe in the scripture doctrine of the Trinity, who worship a fourth person under the title of Our Lady, and a host of inferior deities; and he does not believe in the atonement of Christ, who thinks that his salvation requires another propitiatory sacrifice, such as the mass. In short, there is not one peculiar doctrine of Christianity which the Church of Rome does not directly or indirectly contradict and set aside by her own traditions; and yet there are Protestants, and clergymen too, who publicly maintain in print, that the fundamental principles of their own church, and of that of Rome, are substantially the same.

Berington and Kirk have the merit of going to work in a very regular methodical manner. Euclid himself did not lay down his propositions more distinctly; but Euclid's chief object was, and his great excellence consists in demonstration, in which my authors have failed in almost every instance. I shall give the first three propositions entire, as they are expressed in few words. PROP. I. "When man has sinned, the remission and pardon of sin is not attainable by him, otherwise than in and by the merits of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, who freely purchased our ransom. PROP. II. It is only through the same merits of Jesus Christ, that the just man can obtain either an increase of holiness in this life, or eternal happiness in the next." This seems very sound scriptural doctrine; and there are many pertinent texts adduced to prove that the pardon of sin is to be obtained through Christ alone; yet the first four words of the first proposition contain the germ of a very great error. "*When* man has sinned," implies that sometime or other, he has *not* sinned, or that he is free from sin. This Papists believe to be the case with them all when they have confessed and received absolution from the priest; and it is only *when*, after confession, they have sinned, they need to seek for pardon again. If this were not explicitly taught by the Church of Rome, I might have passed over the above as merely an awkward mode of expression.

PROP. III. "The good works of a just man proceeding from grace and charity, are so far acceptable to God, through his goodness and sacred promises, as to be *truly deserving of an eternal reward*; God crowning his own gifts, when he crowns the good works of his servants." Here the leaven of Antichrist appears more distinctly; and it is that which leavens the whole mass of Popery;—it is the doctrine of human *deserving*, or human *merit*, for the ideas are the same. This strikes at the very root of Christian doctrine; for if any man shall think of his *works as deserving* an eternal reward, in any sense whatever, he cannot be saved by grace, and therefore, if the Bible be true, he cannot be saved at all. He who in any sense deserves a reward, claims it as a debt; and it cannot be withheld from him without injustice. The Church of Rome places her "just man" in the impious and bold attitude of one who can say to his Maker, Pay me that thou owest. He demands his reward, not as a favour, but as an act of justice. It matters not that the expression is guarded on both sides, by such words as, grace and charity, and, God crowning his own gifts when he crowns the good works of his servants. These are words without meaning, when connected with human *deserving*; for where this has possession of the mind, grace can have no place whatever: otherwise grace is no more grace. That is, things divinely established must change their nature, ere man, who is a sinner, can be saved in virtue of his doings or deservings.



The church of Christ in heaven and on earth, with one voice acknowledge, that not by works of righteousness which we have done, that is, not according to our deservings, but according to his mercy he hath saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. If there were a particle of *deserving* in the mind of any one of the glorified saints, it would make such a discordant note in the song of the redeemed, as would mar the harmony of the blessed company, while ascribing salvation to Him that loved them, and washed them from their sins in his own blood.

The proposition on which I am commenting is followed by more than a page of scripture passages given at length ; but there is not a word of man's works deserving a reward in any one of them, of which the reader may satisfy himself by turning to his Bible, according to the following references : Mat. x. 42. xvi. 27. and xxv. 34, 35. 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25. 2 Cor. iv. 17. and v. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Heb. vi. 10. 2 Pet. i. 10. Jam. ii. 14, 17, 26. They give the passages from their own translation, which in these instances at least, is as silent about human merit and deserving as ours. They say a great deal indeed about the glorious reward, with which the people of God shall be crowned in heaven ; but it is all of grace, of sovereign, rich mercy, without the least hint of their having deserved it.

As I hope my readers will examine the passages of the New Testament above referred to, to see if there be any thing of human deserving acknowledged in them, I think it right to observe, that there is one of them which, at first view, may seem to give some countenance to it. It is Heb. vi. 10. " God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love," &c. From this Papists argue, that if it would be *unrighteous* in God not to reward his people's good works, surely they must *deserve* a reward. But the difficulty will vanish when it is recollected that the persons addressed are considered as heirs of salvation ; and who, trusting in the promise of God, had suffered the loss of all things, and had taken joyfully the spoiling of their goods, knowing that they had in heaven a better and an enduring substance. They had endured such things, knowing that God had promised a heavenly inheritance ; they had confided in this promise ; and the words of the apostle strongly assert, that God is not unrighteous to disappoint those who had confided in him, and who had given evidence of their confidence by their work of faith and labour of love. There is nothing in the passage that can lead us to suppose that these works are so *meritorious*, as that it would be unrighteous not to reward them ; but merely that it would be unrighteous in God, not to fulfil his own promise. If we speak of the pardon of sin, as a mere matter of speculation, it would be absurd to say, God would be unjust if he did not pardon it. Yet when the subject is viewed in the light of the gospel, his justice and righteousness are

as conspicuous in the matter as his mercy and faithfulness. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and *just* to forgive us our sins." Not surely because we have deserved or merited forgiveness, but because he has promised this to all who believe in Christ; and his justice as well as his faithfulness is engaged for the fulfilment of the promise.

The authors then very impudently tell their readers, that "the doctrine of these three propositions is very generally admitted, and all controversy on the subject, in regard to the belief of Roman Catholics, has in a great measure ceased." This will serve the purpose of making Papists believe that the doctrine of salvation by grace, without our "works and deservings," is now very generally exploded, and that the grand fundamental article of the Reformation is discarded by Protestants; and if it were so, I would say, there is little remaining of the Reformation, as it respects doctrine, that is worth contending for. But the controversy has not ceased; and it shall not cease while the world stands. It involves no less than the question, whether Christ alone has merited the salvation of his people? or whether they must wholly or in part merit it for themselves? The former is the doctrine of the Bible; the latter is that of false religion under every form. They are as much opposed to one another as light and darkness, Christ and Belial; and the controversy cannot terminate while both of these powers have an interest and a subject in the world.

I am afraid some, even of my Protestant readers, will think I have made more of this expression of the Popish authors than it deserves. They will say, I am disputing about a word; and that there can be little danger in saying our good works *deserve* an eternal reward; when it is admitted that these good works are the gifts of God's own grace. But we ought not to forget, that it was by a single word that the serpent beguiled Eve, and ruined our whole race. "Ye shall NOT surely die," was his assertion, and it is only in one word different from the declaration of God, by which he warned our first parents of what would be the consequence of their disobedience. So this one word, *DESERVE*, in relation to men's works and eternal life, will as effectually overturn and frustrate the grace of the gospel, as the devil's lie did the happiness of the paradisiacal state. As I have said somewhere already, the smallest degree of obliquity extended, will lead to an infinite distance from the right line of truth, so this notion of human *deserving* in the Church of Rome, led by degrees to the monstrous error, that the saints performed more good works than were necessary for themselves, and thus furnished the Pope with a store-house of merit, which he sells for money to those who have none of their own.

THE  
Protestant,

No. CXLVI.

---

SATURDAY, APRIL 28th, 1822.

---

I SHALL occupy a few pages more with a review of Berington and Kirk's work, in order to show how artfully Popish writers introduce their peculiar doctrines, and on what a slight foundation they are made to rest. I say they are artfully introduced; for in the work before me, there is an attempt to bespeak the good opinion of Protestants, by laying down first, certain propositions, which, with a verbal exception or two, seem very orthodox, and such as most Protestants would subscribe. The doctrine of merit, indeed, is rather too plainly expressed in the third proposition to escape the notice of any person acquainted with the Bible. The authors in this instance make a trip in the threshold; but they soon recover their feet; and in the fourth proposition, they speak as soundly as Luther would have done. PROP. IV. "The merits of Jesus Christ, though infinite in themselves, are not applied to us otherwise than by a right faith in him; which faith is one, entire, and conformable to its object, which object is divine revelation, that is, the truths taught by Christ, and to that revelation or to those truths faith gives an undoubting assent." Now, though I do not admire the mode of expression in some parts of the proposition, it is, upon the whole, agreeable to the doctrine of most Protestant churches: so much indeed, that Bishop Poynter finds fault with it, because he says, "it may be inferred that *man is justified by faith alone*." And Mr. Berington replies, by referring to other parts of the work in which his readers are guarded against that *error*. This it seems is the secret by which Papists understand one another's writings; whereas a simple Protestant, having his attention directed to such a proposition as the above, with a number of Scripture texts appended to it, would be led to conclude that the Church of Rome was as sound in the faith as those of England and Scotland.

PROP. V. "The divine revelation contains many mysterious  
VOL. III.



doctrines, surpassing the natural reach of the human understanding : for which reason, it became the wisdom and goodness of God to provide some way or means, whereby man might be enabled to learn what these mysterious doctrines are—means apparent to all, proportioned to the capacities of all, and sure and certain to all.” This again seems all very good, if we are to understand that the means which God has provided for imparting to men the knowledge of the mysterious doctrines of the Bible, are, the enlightening influences of his Holy Spirit, to accompany the reading and preaching of his word ; and this is the import of the passages of Scripture which are cited in support of the proposition ; which are, Mat. xi. 25, 26, and xvi. 17. John xv. 22. 1 Cor. i. 27, and ii. 12, 13. Eph. iv. 11, 14. I request the reader to turn to his Bible, and read all these passages, and judge for himself, whether they do not plainly intimate, that God by his word and Spirit, gives the saving knowledge of his will for their salvation, to children, and others of the capacity of children, without reference to any other authority whatever.

But the legs of the lame are not equal. And thus it is that the greatest Popish authors, even when they state one truth with some degree of propriety, cannot state two together without stumbling into an error. Thus it is that my authors, in their sixth Proposition, overset all that had the appearance of truth in their fifth. The sixth is :—“ The ways or means, by which to arrive at the knowledge of the divine truths, is, by attention and submission to the voice of the pastors of the church ; a church established by Christ for the instruction of all ; spread for that end through all nations ; visibly continued in the succession of pastors and people through all ages. Whence the marks of this church are, unity, visibility, indefectibility, succession from the apostles, universality, and sanctity.”

Here my authors take their departure from every thing that has even a resemblance of real Christianity. They slide away from the authority and teaching of the Holy Spirit by means of the Scriptures, to the authority and teaching of their own church ; that is, of the Pope and his clergy. These become invested with supreme authority over the Scriptures themselves, so as to dictate with infallible certainty what the Scriptures mean ; and what is sacred Scripture and what is not. It is not necessary that I should follow them through all the corruption that unfolds itself in the sequel of their thick octavo volume ; because I have already exposed almost every article of their creed ; and if any candid person should ever be at the pains, after reading this exposition of the “ Faith of Catholics,” to peruse what I have written in former Numbers, I shall not be under any apprehension of hearing him say, that no Protestant has attempted an answer. The fact is, there

is nothing in the work before me but what has been written hundreds of years ago, and answered hundreds of times ; and if this work were replied to by name, and every proposition in it refuted to-morrow, some Papist would come forward next year, with the same things under a new title ; and then he and his party would boast that no man was able to refute *him*.

Let us see, however, in a few instances, how they support their propositions by the authority of Scripture. For the authority of the church as laid down in the sixth proposition, the first quotation is Mat. xviii. 17. " And if he will not hear them, tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." The thing to be proved is, that all men are bound to receive the truths of divine revelation from the lips of the priests, who are divinely commissioned to declare what is the true sense of revelation. This, I say, is what is to be proved ; but what is meant for the proof has no relation to the subject. Let the reader turn to the passage, and he will find that our Lord is prescribing the manner in which an offending brother ought to be treated. If private admonition has no effect upon him, his fault must be told to the church of which he is a member. If he refuse to hear the church ; that is, if her admonition shall not produce the desired effect of making him repent of his fault, then he must be put away, and ever after looked upon as a heathen, as one who never believed the gospel, unless he shall repent ; which, if he do, he may be received into the church again, just like any other man who repents of his sins, and professes his faith in Christ. Here there is not a word of the priests being divinely appointed as the sole oracles of the Christian faith, and the standing, infallible interpreters of the Word of God. The other passages under this head have as little relation to the point which they are adduced to establish. They are as follow ; Mat. xxviii, 18, 19. Mark xvi. 15. Luke x. 16. Rom. x. 17, 18. 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, 1 John iv. 6. Some of these passages relate to the divine commission of the apostles, and the extraordinary authority with which they were invested as Christ's inspired ambassadors ; but there is not a word of their having successors, endowed with the same powers ; yet this is the thing which the Church of Rome asserts, and which these passages are cited to prove.

For the "Unity" of the church, their leading text is, John x. 16. " Other sheep I have which are not of this fold : them also I must bring, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." There can be no question that the church of Christ is one body ; and this text proves it ; but it does not prove it to be the Church of Rome, and therefore it proves nothing to the purpose. Throughout the whole work this is taken for granted, though it is the very point at issue. Hundreds of passages of Scripture are given at

length, descriptive of the purity, and glory, and perpetuity of the church of Christ, as a body united to Him who is the Head; sanctified by his Spirit, so as to be without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; and protected by his mighty power, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. All this we know to be true of the spiritual church of Christ; but in the work before me, and in most other Popish books, it is all applied to the Church of Rome; and applied with such confidence, as if it were universally acknowledged, that she is the holy and spotless spouse of Christ. There is a barefaced impudence in this, as well as an impiety that will find no parallel, but in the other lies and impositions of the upholders of the mystery of iniquity. I have written largely on the difference between the Church of Christ and the Church of Rome, in different parts of my work, and need not resume the subject here. See particularly vol. ii. p. 403—424, and No. CXI.

The 8th proposition of Berington and Kirk, is as follows:—“From the testimony and *authority* of the Catholic church, we receive the Scriptures, and believe them to contain the revealed will of God.” There is not one passage of Scripture adduced to prove this proposition; and not one father earlier than the third century. The 9th proposition is merely an extension of the 8th. Let us see therefore how it is supported by Scripture: “As the church can assuredly tell us, what particular book is the word of God; so can she, with like assurance, tell us the true sense and meaning of it, in controverted points of faith: the same spirit which directed the writing of the Scriptures, directing the church to understand them, and to teach all mysteries and duties as are necessary to salvation.” By the church, the writers still understand the Church of Rome; and that she possesses the privilege here ascribed to her, is attempted to be proved by the 15th of the Acts, which records an application by the church in Antioch to that in Jerusalem, where it was known some of the apostles were, for information upon the question of imposing circumcision upon the Gentile converts; but the Church of Rome has no more to do with this, than the Church of Scotland. The other passages cited are equally irrelevant: see Mat. xvi. 18. and xxviii. 18, 19, 20; John xiv. 16, 26. and xvi. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15. Some of these passages do indeed contain a promise of the presence of the divine Spirit with the apostles, to preserve them from error, and lead them into all truth; and some of them imply a promise of the same Spirit, to be with all true believers for their sanctification and comfort: but what is this to the Church of Rome? Suppose she had continued in the faith of Christ, she would have enjoyed the benefit of these promises only in common with other churches. Before she can justly claim a monopoly of them, she must produce her patent, which she has never yet done.



Besides, it is well known in point of fact, that there never was a church in the world that exhibited a greater variety, and even contrariety of opinions than the Church of Rome. Nay, she actually had within her bosom great *saints*, who taught all the variety of doctrines that are to be found at this day, among all the sects in Christendom, from the highest Supralapsarian down to the lowest Pelagian. The learned are well acquainted with the furious and long continued controversies, on the most fundamental points of doctrine, between the Thomists and the Scotists, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, the Jansenists and the Jesuits. Opposing sects, in different communions, could not be more furiously *pitted* against one another, than those Popish orders were, while abiding in the same communion, which afforded an example of schism, in the proper sense of the word, much more disgraceful than the separation of one sect from another when they cannot live comfortably together. This is matter of fact, known to all the world; and yet the Church of Rome has the effrontery to maintain in the face of the world, that she alone possesses the privilege, of assuredly telling us the true sense and meaning of the Scriptures on controverted points of faith! Here is another absurdity almost equal to transubstantiation!

On the subject of purgatory and prayers for the dead, these authors adduce as their leading proof from Scripture, 2 Maccabees xii. 43—46; and in order to *confirm* what is said in that apocryphal writing, they introduce some passages from the New Testament, which, as I showed, when discussing the doctrine of purgatory, have no relation to the subject. Indeed my authors themselves candidly confess that this doctrine has little support from Scripture. Thus they speak in their introduction:—"The Catholic reader will now be sensible, should any point of his belief seem to receive little support, or even no support, from any text of Scripture, that its truth is not thereby affected, as its divine origin from Christ, and its descent from the apostles, remain the same; and, therefore, that the doctrine of *purgatory* and the *invocation of saints* stands upon the same foundations as that of the authority of the church, though, in support of the former, the evidence of Scripture be comparatively weak. Why, or how, this has happened let him say, "Who hath known the mind of the Lord, and hath been his counsellor." Rom. xi. 34.

With all due submission to these reverend authors, I maintain, that *they* ought to tell us "how this has happened,"—that in support of the doctrine of purgatory, the evidence of Scripture is comparatively weak. Protestants who do not profess to believe any thing in religion but what they find in Scripture, do not pretend to know the mind of the Lord from any other source. But Papists do pretend to know the mind of the Lord independently

of Scripture ; therefore they ought to tell us, why a doctrine that forms an essential and most lucrative part of their system, has little support from Scripture. But it seems, that with all their infallibility, or *inerrancy*, as they pedantically call their faculty of knowing all articles of faith with infallible certainty, they know no more than other men. They do not even know that they know any thing ; for whether they do or not, depends upon their lawful superiors.

I take leave of this work with remarking, that it seems rather intended for confirming Papists, than for converting Protestants ; and I believe it has not been seen by many of the latter. I do not recollect ever to have seen it advertised ; and a learned dignitary of the English church, who has been long engaged in controversy with the Church of Rome, on reading my first notice of it, wrote me that he knew nothing of such a book. I suspect that it was not intended for the Protestant meridian, else some pains would have been taken to make Protestants better acquainted with it.

When speaking, in one of my late Numbers, of the folly of Protestant Dissenters, in petitioning for what is called Catholic emancipation, I remarked, that the wolf might tell a flock of sheep that he had laid aside his claws and his teeth ; but that they would be silly sheep indeed who would believe him. On this subject, a correspondent has favoured me with a communication, with which I conclude the present Number.

---

### AN OLD STORY VERSIFIED,

*By the Rev. JOHN GRAHAM, A. M.*

A CAREFUL shepherd had a flock  
Of thriving sheep—his only stock,  
Their pasture he with walls surrounded,  
As wolves throughout the land abounded.  
Great were his pains, his labour long,  
To make the barrier high and strong ;  
Yet often as he went to sleep,  
The wolf broke in and slew the sheep.  
At last he finds his work complete,  
No entrance left but at the gate ;  
His flock protected and at peace,  
Began to flourish and increase :  
Till full of years, and honest pride  
At his success—the shepherd died.

A son succeeded, mild and kind,  
 Of liberal and gentle mind,  
 Who wish'd indeed to save the sheep,  
 And yet the wolves in humour keep.  
 Him the submissive brutes petition,  
 To pity their forlorn condition;  
 Of their primeval rights denuded,  
 And from the pasturage excluded.  
 They vow'd—they swore—their alter'd mind  
 To sheep had long become so kind,  
 They would not put a tooth or foot on  
 The choicest, fattest leg of mutton.  
 Their ancestors they all confess'd,  
 Of harsher notions were possess'd;  
 Had often broke the shepherd's wall,  
 And made the sheep in thousands fall;  
 Spread death and desolation round,  
 And stain'd with blood the blushing ground.  
 But they—kind souls—had other kidneys  
 As noble as Sir Philip Sidney's.  
 Mild as Melancthon—they would keep,  
 And help to feed this flock of sheep.  
 The shepherd fearing such a trial,  
 Was resolute in his denial;  
 Till by false friends extremely puzzled,  
 He let the wolves in strongly muzzled.  
 Pared from each foot was every claw,  
 And twenty straps bound up each jaw;  
 Each wolf was forc'd an oath to pass,  
 He would eat nothing there but grass.  
 The wall was levell'd and the meeting  
 'Twixt wolves and sheep was grac'd with greeting;  
 One would suppose through all the plain,  
 The golden age was come again;  
 Sheep join'd with wolf, hard names to call  
 The builders of the levell'd wall.  
 A few bold watchmen dared to cry,  
 Against this frightful novelty,  
 And said it soon would come to pass,  
 That wolves would think all flesh is grass;  
 And in their plenitude of power,  
 The silly, feeble sheep devour—  
 These warnings all are giv'n in vain,  
 Within the fold the wolves remain.  
 The watchmen meet contempt and hate,  
 As "born two hundred years too late,"



Vile bigots, who for private ends,  
 Would disunite the new made friends  
 Meantime the claws which had been cut,  
 Grew strong and sharp on every foot ;  
 Some of the straps are old and worn,  
 And others from the muzzle torn ;  
 Slender and few those that remain,  
 Give tenfold discontent and pain,  
 Till as an useless galling "*brand*,"  
 They're all drawn off with gentle hand  
 Then starts the shepherd as from sleep,  
 Resolv'd to save the trembling sheep ;  
 Suspicion shows, and late takes care,  
 New straps and muzzles to prepare :  
 But vain is all precaution now,  
 The grim wolf knits his horrid brow ;  
 The muzzle he rejects with scorn—  
 And on that melancholy morn,  
 Destruction rages through the fold,  
 The sheep are slaughter'd young and old ;  
 In vain for help the shepherd cries,  
 Amidst his butcher'd flock he dies  
 And curses in his hapless fall,  
 The day he moved his father's wall.

*SAT SAPIENTI VERBUM.*

LIFFORD,  
 April 5th, 1821.

Happily this *jeu d'esprit* is nothing but a fable, though when it was written, and even when I sent it to the compositor, there was some probability of its soon becoming a reality. The wall must now remain uninjured, and the wolf be kept out of the fold for another year at least; and perhaps by that time, the wolves will be regarded with such favour by a majority of the shepherds, that they will be admitted without any muzzle at all. I think my worthy correspondent has made a slight mistake in representing the wolves as acknowledging the faults of their ancestors, and professing that they themselves were more kind and gentle; for certainly the wolf of the present day possesses the same qualities as wolves possessed a thousand years ago; and those whom the animal is meant to represent, do not profess to be different from their ancestors. The tendency of all their writings, at this day, is to make it appear that their religion was always tolerant and merciful; that their fathers were always persecuted, but never persecutors; which, in point of fact, is about as true, as that sheep have always been in the habit of devouring wolves, but that wolves never devoured sheep.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXLVII.

---

SATURDAY, MAY 5th, 1821.

---

I HAVE lately received from a correspondent, on the continent, a document which is curious in itself, and of considerable importance in my controversy with the Church of Rome. Those who are acquainted with the correspondence which was carried on in the Glasgow Chronicle, in which this work commenced, will recollect that I mentioned a famous bull of indulgence, which had been granted by the Pope to the ancient house of Kilravak. The existence of this bull was positively denied by one or both of my opponents; and on my referring to several literary gentlemen by name, who could bear witness that they had seen it, the objectors were silenced, though they had not the grace to make confession, or acknowledge their error. The document before me is not merely a bull of indulgence granted to a family, but it actually confers upon an individual the power of granting a dispensation, relating to matters of the greatest importance in morals, to as many as he pleases. My correspondent says, "I have very unexpectedly got my hands upon the original of the subjoined document, signed by the proper authorities at Rome, and stamped by the *Sigillum Officii Sacri*." "It may be necessary," says he, "to mention, that these powers of absolution are given by his holiness only, to the dignitaries of the church, such as archbishops and bishops of the different dioceses, as also to a few who are high in favour with the court of cardinals. You may, therefore, know how difficult it is to get a sight of such a document. I am not at liberty to say how I obtained it, or to give the name of the *favoured one* to whom it is addressed, but I give you it, word for word, even to its errors." From prudential considerations, I forbear giving the name of my correspondent, for English gentlemen travelling in Popish countries, are in danger of getting into trouble, by writing to their friends what they see and hear, especially if it happen to meet the eye of any Jesuit, who could soon communicate the fact to his brother Jesuit in any part of Europe, and the hapless traveller would be in danger of being overtaken by the officers of the inquisition.

The reader, however, may perfectly rely on the authenticity of the following. The learned will, indeed, perceive from the monkish style of the Latin, that it cannot be a piece of British Protestant manufacture. The errors in point of style which my correspondent mentions, have made it difficult to render some parts of it into English; and though I have availed myself of the aid of a

classical scholar, I am not sure that the translation is perfectly correct. I therefore give the original *verbatim et literatim*, as I received it. I would not willingly do injustice even to the Pope ; and if any of his children, who may be supposed to understand their father's language better than Protestants, shall point out any mistake in the translation, I shall cheerfully publish it.

It is addressed on the back, "Tibi Dilecto in Christo,——  
Salutem in Domino. Ex S. Pœnitentiaria Gratis."\* Its title within is, "MICHAEL MISERATIONE DIVINA EPISCOPUS ALBAN-  
ENSIS, S. R. E. CARDINALIS DE PETRO SS. DD. PAPÆ ET SEDIS  
APOSTOLICÆ MAJOR PœNITENTIARIUS." and then commences.

"Tibi dilecto in Christo Confessario ab Ordinario Loci ad exci-  
piendas utriusque sexus Sacramentales Confessiones legitime ap-  
probato infrascriptas concedimus facultates, quibus, pro Foro  
Conscientiæ, et in Sacramentali Confessione, Auctoritate Apos-  
tolica, uti valeas, et non aliter ; Ita tamen ne debeas illas cuilibet  
manifestare ; nisi necessitas, aut utilitas id exegerit.

Primo. Absolvendi ab Excommunicatione ob manus violentas  
injectas in Clericos, aut Presbyteros, sive Sæculares, sive Regu-  
lares, in casibus tamen non deductis, nec de facili ad Forum  
Ordinarii deducendis ; dummodo non sit sequuta mors, vel mutila-  
tio seu Lathale vulnus, aut ossium fractio ; et injuncta congrua  
Pœnitentia salutari, cum obligatione caute et competenter satis-  
faciendi parti læsæ.

II. Absolvendi a Censuris contra Duellantes inflictis, dummodo  
casus ad Forum Ordinarii non fuerint deducti : Injuncta gravi  
Pœnitentia salutari, et aliis injunctis, quæ fuerint de jure injun-  
genda.

III. Absolvendi quoscumque Pœnitentes sive Viros, sive Mu-  
lieres (exceptis Hæreticis publicis, sive publice Dogmatizantibus)  
a quibusvis Sententiis, Censuris, et Pœnis Ecclesiasticis ob Hæ-  
reses tam nemine audiente, vel advertente ; quam coram aliis  
externatas, ob Infidelitatem, et Catholicæ fidei abjuramentum pri-  
vate admissas, Sortilegia, ac Maleficia etiam cum sociis patrata,  
necnon ob Dæmonis invocationem cum pacto donandi animam,  
eique præstitam Idololatriam, ac Superstitiones exercitas, ac  
demum ob quæcumque insinuata falsa Dogmata incursis, post-  
quam tamen Pœnitens complices, si quos in præmissis habeat,  
ordinario Loci, vel Saceræ Inquisitionis ministro in locis, in  
quibus viget Saceræ Inquisitionis Auctoritas, prout de Jure, de-  
nunciaverit : In aliis vero locis, facta a Pœnitente seria promissio  
denunciationem peragendi cum primum, et meliori modo quo  
judicio tuo fieri poterit, coram Ordinario Loci ; Et postquam, in  
singulis casibus hæreses coram Te secrete abjuraverit, et pactum  
cum maledicto Dæmone initum expresse revocaverit, tradita tibi  
syngrapha forsitan exarata, aliisque mediis superstitionis, ad omnia

\* Probably for Gratia.



comburenda, Injuncta pro modo excessuum gravi Pœnitentia salutari cum frequentia Sacramento, et obligatione se prudenti judicio tuo retractandi apud personas coram quibus hæreses manifestavit, et reparandi illata scandala.

IV. Absolvendi a Censuris incursis ob violationem Clausuræ Regularium utriusque sexus, dummodo non fuerit cum intentione ad malum finem, etiam effectu non sequuto, et dummodo casus non fuerint ad Forum Ordinarii deducti; cum congrua Pœnitentia salutari. Et insuper absolvendi mulieres tantum a Censuris, et pœnis Ecclesiasticis, ob violationem ad malum finem Clausuræ Virorum Religiosorum incursis, dummodo tamen casus occulti remaneant; Injuncta gravi Pœnitentia salutari, cum prohibitione accedendi ad Ecclesiam, et Conventum, seu Cœnobium dictorum Religiosorum, durante occasione peccandi.

V. Absolvendi a Censuris ob retentionem, et Lectionem Librorum prohibitorum incursis, postquam tamen Pœnitens Libros prohibitos, quos in sua potestate retineat, ordinario Loci, seu alii, cui de jure consignaverit, vel consignandos, Tibi dederit; Injuncta congrua Pœnitentia salutari.

VI. Absolvendi a casu Sedi Apostolicæ reservato ob accepta munera a Regularibus utriusque sexus; injuncta Pœnitentia, et quando agitur de muneribus infra valorem decem scutorum, aliqua elemosyna judicio tuo taxanda, et caute eroganda, cum primum poterit, in beneficium Religionis, cui facienda esset restitutio; dummodo tamen non constet, quod illa fuerint de bonis propriis Religionis: quatenus vero accepta munera vel fuerint ultra valorem scutorum decem, vel constet fuisse de Bonis propriis Religionis, facta prius restitutione, quam si de præsentis adimplere nequeat, præstita in tuis manibus obligatione restituendi intra terminum tuo arbitrio præfiniendum, alias sub reincidentia.

VII. Absolvendi Religiosos cujuscumque ordinis (exceptis monialibus, nisi fueris pro ipsis ab Ordinario Loci approbatus vel deputatus) non solum a præmissis, sed etiam a Casibus, et Censuris in sua Religione reservatis.

VIII. Commutandi, consideratis causis, omnia Vota simplicia, in alia Pœnitentiæ, seu pietatis opera: exceptis quinque Votis Sedi Apostolicæ reservatis, scilicet Castitatis, et Religionis, ac trium Peregrinationum, nempe ad Sacra SS. Apostolorum Limina, ad S. Jacobum in Compostellis, et ad Jerusalem; nec non Votis pœnialibus ad sese arcendum a peccatis; et insuper Voto non ludendi; ac Votis, in quibus agitur de præjudicio, vel de Jure Tertii.

IX. Dispensandi ad petendum debitum Conjugale cum Transgressore Voti Castitatis, qui Matrimonium cum dicto Voto contraxerit: Monendo hujusmodi pœnitentem, ad idem votum servandum teneri, tam extra licitum usum Matrimonii, quam si Marito, seu Uxori respective supervixerit.

X. Dispensandi cum Incestuoso, sive Incestuosa, ad petendum debitum conjugale, cujus jus amisit ex superveniente occulta affinitate per copulam carnalem habitam cum Consanguinea, vel Con-

sanguineo, sive in primo, sive in primo et secundo, sive in secundo gradu suæ Uxoris, seu respective Mariti: remota occasione peccandi: Et injuncta gravi pœnitentia salutari, et Confessione Sacramentali semel quolibet mense, per tempus arbitrio tuo statuendum.

XI. Dispensandi super occulto Impedimento primî, necnon primî, et secundi, ac secundi tantum gradus affinitatis provenientis ex illicita copula, quando agatur de Matrimonio cum dicto impedimento jam contracto: Ita tamen, ut, si hujusmodi affinitas proveniat ex copula cum Matre Desponsatæ nativitas Desponsatæ copulam ipsam antecedit: Monito Pœnitente de necessaria secreta renovatione consensus cum sua putata Uxore, vel suo putato Marito, certiorato, seu certiorato de nullitate prioris consensus, sed ita caute, ut ipsius delictum nusquam detegatur: Remota occasione peccandi: atque injuncta gravi Pœnitentia salutari, et Confessione Sacramentali semel in mense per tempus arbitrio tuo statuendum.

XII. Dispensandi super impedimento occulto Criminis, dummodo sit absque ulla machinatione, et agatur de Matrimonio jam contracto: Monitis putatis Conjugibus de necessaria secreta renovatione consensus: ac injuncta gravi Pœnitentia salutari, et Confessione Sacramentali semel quolibet mense, per tempus arbitrio tuo statuendum.

XIII. Item dispensandi super occulta Irregularitate contracta ex violatione Censurarum dumtaxat cum Sacerdotibus, vel in Sacris Ordinibus constitutis, tam Sæcularibus, quam Regularibus.

Volumus tamen, ut supradictis facultatibus De licentia proprii Ordinarii uti valeas tantummodo per Triennium, a data præsentium computandum: Et abstineas absolvere a Casibus Reservatis Locorum Ordinariis, nisi facultatem ab iisdem obtinueris.

*Datum Romæ ex Ædibus Nostris,  
die 9 Decembri, 1819.*

(Signed)

R. MAZIO, S. E. Corrector.

And upon the back of the Seal,

(Signed)

J. Pio, S. Pœnitentiæ, Secretarius.

#### POPISH INSTRUMENT.

*Translation.*

Endorsed on the back,

“To thee ——— beloved in Christ; safety in the  
Lord. From the Holy Penitentiary, Grace.”

Entitled within,

“Michael by Divine mercy, Bishop of Albania, of the  
Holy Roman Church. Cardinal *de Petro*, and  
Superior Penitentiary of our Holy Lords, the Pope  
and the Apostolic See.”

And commencing,

“To thee ——— beloved in Christ, Confessor, legally approved  
by the Ordinary of the place for receiving the Sacramental confessions of both sexes, we grant the undermentioned powers, which

thou art empowered to use for a Court of Conscience, and in Sacramental confession by Apostolic authority, and not otherwise. So, however, that thou oughtest not to exhibit them to any one, unless necessity or utility should require it.

First. Power of absolving from excommunication on account of having laid violent hands on the Clergy or Presbyters, whether secular or regular : in cases, however, that have not been brought, or that cannot easily be brought before the Court of the Ordinary, provided that death has not ensued, or mutilation, or a mortal wound, or a fracture of the bones. A heavy and salutary Penance being enjoined, with the obligation of carefully and sufficiently satisfying the party injured.

Second. Of absolving from the censures pronounced upon Duellists ; provided that the cases have not been brought before the court of the Ordinary. A heavy and salutary Penance being enjoined and all other things which ought of right to accompany it.

Third. Of absolving all the Penitent, whether men or women, (except avowed Heretics, or those who openly teach their doctrines) from all kinds of sentences, censures, and ecclesiastical penalties, on account of Heresy, whether when no person heard or observed it ; or when thrown out in the hearing of others :—for Infidelity, and abjuration of the Catholic faith, privately avowed ;—Sorcery and witchcraft committed with accomplices ; also for invocation of the Devil and an agreement of consigning to him their soul ; for idolatrous worship paid him, and unhallowed rites ; and in short for every kind of false doctrine inculcated ; after however the Penitent, as of right he ought, has disclosed his accomplices in the afore-mentioned crimes, if he has any, to the Ordinary of the place, or to the officer of the Holy Inquisition, in those places where the authority of the Holy Inquisition prevails. In other places, however, let the Penitent come under a solemn engagement of communicating this disclosure, as soon as possible, and in the way which shall seem to you the best, before the Ordinary of the place. And after he shall, in every instance, have secretly abjured the heresies before you, and recalled the compact entered into with the evil one ;—and have delivered to you the written agreement executed, if any ; with the other symbols of superstition, that they may all be burned. Having enjoined according to the degree of his wickedness a severe and salutary penance, with a frequent use of sacraments, and exacted an obligation of retracting his sentiments according to your prudent advice, in presence of those before whom the heresies were uttered ; and of removing the scandal so produced.

Fourth. Of absolving from censures incurred by the violation of the residences of Religious Orders of either sex, provided that it was not done intentionally for a wicked purpose, and without any event having followed from it, and whilst the cases have not been brought before the Court of the Ordinary ;—with a suitable and salutary penance. And moreover of absolving women only,



from the censures and ecclesiastica. penantes incurred by having violated for a wicked purpose the residence of Religious men, whilst only the cases remain concealed : having prescribed a severe and salutary Penance, with a prohibition from entering any Church, Convent, or Monastery of the said Religious orders, during the continuance of the Penance.

Fifth. Of absolving from the censures incurred for retaining and perusing prohibited Books :—after, however, the Penitent shall have delivered up the prohibited books which he may have in his possession, or intrusted them to thee that they may be delivered up ; to the Ordinary of the place or to some other person lawfully authorized to receive them. A suitable and salutary penance being enjoined.

Sixth. Of absolving from a case reserved for the determination of the Apostolic See, for gifts received from Regulars of either sex, penance being enjoined. And when the case is concerning gifts under the value of ten Scuta,\* some charitable donation is to be required at thy discretion, and carefully exacted as soon as possible for the benefit of Religion, to which restitution was to have been made ; provided always that it does not appear that these gifts were of the proper effects of Religion. In so far, however, as the accepted gifts were either above the value of ten Scuta, or appear to have been given out of the proper effects of Religion, restitution is to be previously made, which if the individual cannot immediately perform, an obligation is to be lodged in thy hands that this shall be done within a certain limited time to be fixed by thy judgment ; otherwise according to circumstances.

Seventh. Of absolving the Religious of every order, (except Nuns, unless thou hast been approved of, or authorized, by the Ordinary of the place, to act for them) not only from the aforesaid, but also from Cases, and censures, reserved for the determination of their own community.

Eighth. Of commuting, on having considered the causes, all simple Vows, into others of Penance, or works of piety ; with the exception of the Five Vows reserved for the Apostolic See, viz. of Chastity, of Religion, of the Three Pilgrimages, namely to the sacred threshold of the Holy Apostles ; to St. James in *Compostellis*, and to Jerusalem ; and from the penal vows to restrain themselves from sin ; and from the vow against indulging in amusement ; and from vows made with respect to Prejudice and the *Jus Tertii*.

Ninth. Of granting a dispensation to a Transgressor of the Vow of Chastity, who has contracted a matrimonial connexion with this vow upon him, to obtain the *Debitum Conjugale*. Such a Penitent being admonished that in every other respect except the lawful matrimonial privilege, this vow is to be considered bind-

\* A Scuta or Scudi is about four shillings sterling.

ing, as also in the event of surviving the husband or wife respectively.

Tenth. Of granting a dispensation to an incestuous man or woman, to obtain the *Debitum Conjugale*, which right he or she had lost from a supervening secret affinity, by a carnal connexion having taken place with a male or female relation, whether in the first, or in the first and second, or in the second degree of his wife or her husband respectively. The occasion of the sin being removed; and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once every month, for a period to be appointed according to thy judgment.

Eleventh. Of granting a dispensation with regard to a secret impediment of the first, also of the first and second, and of the second degree of affinity by itself, arising from unlawful connexion: when the question is concerning Matrimony already contracted with that impediment existing. So, however, that if an affinity of this kind arises from connexion with the mother of the espoused woman, the birth of the espoused shall have preceded that connexion. The Penitent being admonished of the necessity of a secret renewal of the compact with his supposed wife, or the woman with her supposed husband; or assured of the nullity of the former compact; but so cautiously that the delinquency shall by no means be made public. The cause of crime being removed, and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once a month, for a period to be fixed by thy judgment.

Twelfth. Of granting dispensation with regard to the secret impediment of a crime, provided that it has occurred without any evil design, and the question is respecting matrimony already contracted. The supposed spouses being admonished of the necessity of a secret renewal of the bond, and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once every month, for a period to be fixed by thy judgment.

Thirteenth. Likewise of granting dispensation concerning a secret irregularity contracted by a violation of censures, namely, with Priests, or those in Holy Orders whether Secular or Regular.

It is our will, however, that thou shouldst be empowered to use the above mentioned powers by License from the proper Ordinary for three years only, from the date of these presents; and that thou shouldst abstain from granting absolution from cases reserved for the Ordinaries of the various places, unless power to do so is obtained from them.

Given at Rome, from our Palace, on the ninth day of  
December, 1819.

(Signed)

R. MAZIO,

Corrector of the Holy Church.

(And upon the back of the Seal) J. Pro,

Secretary of the Holy Penitentiary."

I shall not make many remarks on this modern piece of Popish jugglery: but it lets out certain secrets with regard to the practice of *religious* persons, which it is worth while to mention; such for instance, as the monks and nuns being in the practice of stealing into one another's apartments. The 4th clause empowers the confessor to grant absolution for this fault, which would have been needless if the practice did not exist. Nay, so profligate and shameless are these *religious* women, that they will violate for a wicked purpose the apartments of the *religious* men; and the confessor is empowered to grant absolution for this, provided it be kept secret. This is the fruit of their vows of chastity! this is the boasted sanctity of those who have obtained *holy* orders, and who profess to have fled from the pollutions of the world!

We learn from the third clause that, as lately as the year 1819, sorcery and witchcraft, and the crime of making unlawful bargains with the devil, were understood to be practised in the Church of Rome. Whether such things are really practised, I shall not take upon me to say; but it is certain that the Pope and his "holy lords" believe they are; from which we may infer that the gross darkness of the tenth century has not yet passed away from the capital of the *Christian* world.

The 8th clause empowers the confessor to dispense with all simple vows, five only excepted, on condition of some penance or pious work being performed; and as those of civil allegiance are not excepted, the confessor can, whenever he pleases, relieve a man from the obligation of any oath he may have taken to the king or government that affords him protection. The simple fact that this is an existing law in the Church of Rome, ought to open the eyes of some of our statesmen and others, who seem to have fallen into a most romantic fit of love and affection for the children of Babylon, if not for the old lady herself. Every reader of history knows that the Pope exercised the power of absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance; and here is a proof that he does so still, which proves what I have all along maintained, that Popery is unchanged, let simple Protestants say what they will to the contrary.

The 9th, 10th, and 11th clauses need no comment. They lay open so plainly the gross wickedness which Rome tolerates, that I think no person can doubt the truth of what I asserted at the commencement of my work, that the Church of Rome grants indulgence, or rather dispensation to her members to commit sin.

I had prepared to be inserted here the present state of Rome with regard to indulgences, from a work entitled, "Rome in the 19th century," but I find I have not room for it. It will appear in a future Number.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CXLVIII.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, MAY 12th, 1821.  
~~~~~

THE following was intended for the conclusion of last Number, but was omitted for want of room:—

“Plenary indulgence and remission of sins’ are liberally offered here on very easy terms. I was at first rather startled with the prodigal manner in which that full pardon of all transgressions, which the gospel promises only as the reward of sincere repentance and amendment,\* was bestowed at Rome, in consideration of repeating certain prayers before the shrine of certain saints, or paying a certain sum of money to certain priests.

“I was surprised to find scarcely a church in Rome, that did not hold up at the door the tempting inscription of ‘*Indulgentia Plenaria.*’ Two hundred days’ indulgence I thought a great reward for every kiss bestowed upon the great black cross in the Coliseum; but that is nothing to the indulgences for ten, twenty, and even thirty thousands of years, that may be bought, at no exorbitant rate, in many of the churches;† so that it is amazing what a vast quantity of treasure may be amassed in the other world with very little industry in this, by those who are avaricious of this

\* The reader will be aware that these are not THE PROTESTANT’S words.

† You may buy as many masses as will free your soul from purgatory for 29,000 years at the church of St. John Lateran, on the festival of that saint; at Santa Bibiana, on All Soul’s Day, for 7,000 years; at a church near the Basilica of St. Paul, and at another on the Quirinal Hill, the names of both of which I have unluckily forgotten, for 10,000, and for 3,000 years, and at a very reasonable rate. But it is vain to particularise, for the greater part of the principal churches in Rome and the neighbourhood, are spiritual shops for the sale of the same commodity.

spiritual wealth, into which indeed the dross or riches of this world may be converted with the happiest facility imaginable.

“We are told that ‘it is easier for a camel to enter into the eye of a needle, than a rich man into the kingdom of heaven,’ but at Rome at least, it would seem to be difficult, nay, impossible, to keep a rich man out.”

Rome, in the nineteenth century, *Literary Gazette*, No 213, p. 101.  
February 17, 1821.

The 144th Number of the Protestant broke off in the middle of a letter from a gentleman in a remote part of Ireland, who has the advantage, if such it may be called, of seeing Popery in its naked deformity. Having stated the fact that a miraculous virtue was supposed to reside in the clay that had touched the coffin of a priest in his neighbourhood, lately deceased, my correspondent proceeds:—

“The writer saw a woman, a cripple, who, hearing of this celebrated relic, had been taken there for a cure; on her return, being asked if she had received any benefit, she replied she did, but her husband saying she did not, the wife asked him how he could dare to deny that a miracle was wrought in her, *though he could not see it!* Indeed, this idea is not at all unfamiliar to them, since they are accustomed to believe that bread and wine is transubstantiated into the very body, bones and blood of our Lord, although to their visual comprehension, they still remain the same substances without any alteration whatsoever. I had in my possession a *printed* paper, giving an account of some of the miracles performed at the shrine of this saint, and headed, “*Miracles have not ceased;*” these were *publicly* cried through the towns by hawkers, of one of whom I purchased the copy.

“Those who receive any benefit by such impostures, are the priests and the publicans; (the latter erect booths around these precious relics, as long as curiosity, faith, or superstition invite customers,) and it is natural enough that this should be the case, and that they should act in concert, for while the former are vending their clays, the latter are vending their spirits. It is remarkable, that wherever there is a saint’s day held, (called a Patron,) you will uniformly find the greatest superstitions succeeded by the grossest sensuality, drunkenness, and vices of all kinds. The writer had been a long time at a loss to conjecture the cause of this intimate connexion between superstition and vice, until he was informed by a Roman Catholic, a *great devotee*, in his employment, and whom he accused with getting drunk, that, as it was committed on a saint’s day, *it was no sin*, for they believed that each of the saints ask and receive the *pardon of all sins* committed on the days kept for their commemoration, provided they attended the prayers

offered up to them in the chapel. We therefore need not wonder why so many saints' days are kept in Ireland, since such great benefits are said to arise from them. Indeed, the wonder is, that they do not make saints' days of every day in the year; but on recollection, this would not be agreeable to the priests, for if the people believed that the intercession of the saints in their favour went on daily, and as a matter in course, there would be nothing left for the priest to do—or, what would be worse—to receive.

“Is it therefore a matter of surprise that Papists are held back from education by every means, and even threats held out by their priests, since it is so much for their advantage to prevent the moral and religious improvement of their parishioners; and they have brought them so completely into obedience, (I mean the lower orders) that they can make them believe the grossest impositions of their church in opposition to their reason.

“The mind of man is naturally desirous of knowledge, but if you can draw off the mind from seeking more rational attainments to rest in superstitions you thereby enervate the faculties, and make the understanding a mere machine to be impressed or impelled at the will of the mover. The common Irish, Sir, do not want naturally good capacities; they are intelligent, generous, and unsuspicious, and if these qualities were improved by a real, not pretended moral and religious education, they would not come behind the most celebrated of other countries—but these mental endowments are beclouded by the dense and gross atmosphere which every where overhangs Popery, preventing any rays of intellectual light to shine out.

“Of late years there have been many efforts made by the Protestants in Ireland to improve the condition of the lower orders, by the establishment of schools calculated to promote their moral and religious improvement,—and, as a means best calculated to produce these desirable ends, the *Bible* simply, without note, comment, or catechetical lectures of any kind, has been introduced into their schools, one would reasonably suppose that no objection could be taken against the morality of the Bible as a reading book; but this is not the case, the most violent determined opposition is every where given to the admission of Roman Catholic children into these schools by their priests, who, dreading the effects of a moral and religious education, denounce publicly and repeatedly the parents of those few children who attend. In the town where I live, at this present time, week after week, the thunders of the church are hurled from the altar against some, whose only crime is the anxiety they have to get instruction for their children. Their names are individually called out, to make them obnoxious to the rest, and every curse poured forth



upon their devoted heads. It is of no avail to inform the priests that during the fifteen years which this school has been established no one instance of any attempt to proselyte, by drawing away the Roman Catholics from the communion of their church, can be adduced, it is of no value to assure them that the object of the school is *solely* to convey moral and religious instruction by means of the Bible and the Bible alone, without any notes, comments, or catechetical lectures whatsoever, and that they recognize no sect or party amongst the children in their schools. The priest's answer invariably is, "we cannot allow the Bible to be read by the people," "they must only hear such explanations from it as we choose to give." On expostulating with a younger priest here, on this subject, he replied, he was only obeying the orders of his bishop, whom he was bound to obey, by the most solemn and sacred oaths taken at his ordination, and of which his bishop frequently reminded him, nor did he execute his directions with that *severity he ought*; for he was positively directed by his bishop to bring all the children who were sent by their parents to this school before him; and while he denounced all the curses of the church against their parents by *name*, the children were ordered to *curse their own parents*, by pronouncing audibly at the end of each curse, Amen!!!

"It is a precept of the divine law to 'honour thy father and mother; and he that curseth father or mother let him die the death.' Matth. xv. 4. But the Popish bishops and priests order, that children shall *curse* their fathers and mothers; and they that shall refuse to curse their fathers and mothers, shall be cursed, and that bitterly by the Holy Mother Church.

"To counteract the growing avidity for education amongst the lower orders of the people of Ireland, the priests have established in most parishes, what are called monks' and nuns' schools, that is, schools kept by monks and nuns, for what they are pleased to term, the moral and religious education of the poor Roman Catholic children,—the entire of which nearly consists in teaching the children to repeat their Catechisms and Rosaries—it is evident that the sole object of establishing these schools is to prevent the children's being sent to the free schools of the Hibernian School Society, and thereby hold them in ignorance; complaints are frequently made by the parents that their children, after a close attendance at these schools for two or three years, do not learn as much as children sent to the free schools do in as many months; and the writer has known instances, where even poor labourers have preferred paying something for their children's education rather than lose their time at the schools of these monks and nuns, who are generally as ignorant as their predecessors of the 9th and 10th centuries. To support these establishments every means are

used to prevail on Roman Catholics, living and dying, to give or bequeath a proportion of their properties to such pious uses ; and the great merit of keeping poor Catholics from Protestant heresy is pointed out to them in the most glowing colours.

“ However, in the division of the booty thus obtained, things do not always go on as smoothly as they could wish. Take a recent instance of some notoriety, which occurred in a pretty large town in Ireland. The pastors of the Holy Mother Church having prevailed on a wealthy Papist to bequeath, for the good of his soul, the interest of a large sum of money for the education of poor children in the Roman Catholic faith ; the monks and nuns each contrived to possess themselves of a moiety of this property for the purpose or pretence above-mentioned, and left the parish priest in the lurch ; but as his reverence thought he had as good a right to his share of the booty as the monks and nuns, *who had made vows of poverty!* he endeavoured to wrest it out of their hands, and made representations to the trustees that the parties in possession were totally unqualified to teach the children, being ignorant themselves of the very rudiments of learning. Now as the priest’s opponents could not perhaps well rebut this charge without first going to school, for which they were rather elderly, they attacked the priest where he was most vulnerable, they charged him *upon oath*, with being guilty of certain practices, not reckoned amongst Protestants at least, very moral ; such as kissing the young females at confession, &c. but although these nuns did not throw the veil over the grossest crimes with which they charged their priest, I must, for they are too indelicate to be mentioned. The priest, you may be sure, did not remain an idle or an indifferent spectator during these proceedings ; he also accused the brotherhood and sisterhood upon oath with perjury, the subornation of witnesses, and with other immoral practices of a more personal and private nature. How this dispute will end is uncertain, it being referred to a higher tribunal.

“ The parishioners have also divided, part siding with the priest, and part with the holy fraternity ; and to such a height has this enmity been excited, that they have more than once from invectives come to blows.

“ ‘ By their fruits ye shall know them,’ is a short but very comprehensive direction, given us by our Lord himself for the examination of individual or collective character :—‘ For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit ; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit ;’ now applying this rule to the religion of Papists, we shall find, that their practice produces fruit the very reverse of every moral law contained in the Bible. Every religious rite and ceremony from the cradle to the grave is, amongst them, succeeded by the grossest sensualities ; and whether we observe their christen-

ings, weddings, wakes, or funerals, they are all attended with the grossest idolatry and superstitions, and succeeded (among the lower orders) by revellings, drunkenness, and such like; 'of the which,' says the apostle, 'I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' The priests in Ireland look upon the unmarried daughters of their parishioners as forming a considerable proportion of their wealth; for a large share of their fees or perquisites arises from their weddings,—no female being allowed to marry out of her own parish; the priests therefore are extremely anxious to encourage matrimony, and they are frequently engaged in match makings. It being the rule or custom for the guests invited to the weddings of the better sort to pay the priest according to their abilities, he is anxious that a large number should be invited, and that a plentiful dinner be provided at the bride's father's expense; the whisky is so abundant on these occasions as to be sometimes brought out in cans, the priest himself partaking largely of the banquet; piping, dancing, and drinking, continues through the night. On these occasions the priest himself generally opens the dance with the bride, particularly if the collections are large. A melancholy accident not long since occurred at one of these weddings—the chimney happening to catch fire, one of the party took up a can of whisky, which he supposed to contain water, and dashed it on the flames, the spirits instantly exploded, and blew up most of the company.

"One very bad effect must always result from the interest the priests have to promote marriages; which is, that instead of dissuading, they induce the poorest sort who can beg, borrow, or steal a guinea, to marry, without having any provision made for a family; and they thus entail poverty and mendicity on the country. I have known matches of this kind so hastily made up, that the parties contracting had not seen each other before that day, and so poor as to be obliged to borrow a guinea for the priest, for he won't take less, and if the parties should be under any church censures, he requires more. Ireland is thus over-peopled with a poor, ignorant, superstitious peasantry; and what is worse, there is no prospect of any change in their circumstances, while Popery holds them in her iron grasp, whose interest it is to keep them superstitious, by keeping them in ignorance. Nothing except a national system of general education for the poor, agreeably to the plans of the Hibernian School Society, where the *scriptures alone* are made the reading book, can effectually and finally promote the moral, intellectual, and religious improvement of Ireland, and this subject is well worthy the attention of the legislature.

"J. A."

This plain unvarnished narrative exhibits such a view of Popery,



as ought to excite universal detestation, not against the poor deluded people, but at the conduct of their priests, whose sole business seems to be, to maintain the reign of ignorance and error, to rob the people of their little hard earned property, and to fatten upon the spoil: yet it has lately become fashionable to eulogize these priests as if they were the most virtuous men in the world. Panegyrists of their own communion boast of the "spotless purity" of their character; Protestant senators, in both houses, vie with one another in expressions of commendation, or in tacitly admitting the extraordinary merit of these ghostly deceivers; and it is esteemed of so much importance to Ireland to preserve the breed, that a college was twenty-five years ago erected at Maynooth for the purpose, at an expense to the public, originally, of about 40,000*l.* and an annual charge of about 8000*l.* ever since. This was no doubt meant for the best; but I am persuaded nothing of the kind would have occurred had the real character of the priests been better known to men in power. No dissenting sect in Britain ever received such countenance and support as is thus granted to Irish Papists, and yet these Papists are incessantly complaining of being an insulted, oppressed, and persecuted people.

"In 1795," says a late writer, "Maynooth College was established by an act of Parliament; by which, certain trustees were empowered to receive donations for establishing and endowing an academy for the education of persons professing the Romish religion, and to acquire lands, free from forfeiture by mortmain. Little short of 40,000*l.* was granted for its establishment at first; and in every subsequent session, a regular charge of 8000*l.* has been made to parliament, for its annual support. I may add, too, that this does not appear to content them. I have heard it represented as trifling, by gentlemen of that better informed, or rather deeper initiated class of Romanists, as to faith and doctrine, which is recognised as composed of 'competent expounders;' while the encouragement of the Protestant charter schools, has been spoken of with contempt, dislike, and jealousy." *The true state of the Question, by Joseph Spearing, junr.* p. 229, Cork, 1816. The tithe of the money thus thrown away by Protestants, in bolstering up a system of idolatry and superstition, would go a great length in teaching the people to read the word of God, upon the economical plan of the Hibernian Society; but it has not yet appeared *politically* necessary to teach the poor Irish to read the Bible; at least not so necessary as the maintaining a regular succession of Popish priests. Candour, however, requires me to say, that in this matter there was only a choice of evils. The Maynooth College was not endowed because our government wished to encourage Popery; but because it was reckoned better to have the

priests educated at home, than to lay them under the necessity of going abroad for education. My opinion is, that the worst of the evils was chosen ; but I do not profess to be a politician.

A correspondent has favoured me with the following recipe for making Italian scap, with which I conclude the present Number. The reader will not consider it below the dignity of my work, seeing it has so close a relation to the person of the present head of the Romish Church. It is extracted from Galiffico's Letters, relating to Italy and its inhabitants, 1816, 1817, translated by John Murray, London, 1820. After describing Cardinal Gonsalvi as the most popular minister that any Pope ever had, the author proceeds, page 23 :—" Whatever may be the liberality of the prime minister, it is not sufficient to put a stop to the most absurd superstition. Little prints of the miracles attributed to the present Pope, were publicly sold in the streets of Rome ; and some time before our arrival, an immense number of his shirts were sold in retail to the common people, and perhaps to better informed persons also, who fully believed that a small piece of one of them boiled in their soup, was the surest of all remedies against any disorder. I could not have credited this story, if I had not had it from a very honest merchant, who told it to me in the simplicity of his heart, as a thing of which no real Christian could entertain a doubt." It is not said whether the shirts were first washed ; but it is to be presumed they were not ; for washing would take the virtue out of them.

Another curious piece has come in my way this week, for which, I see by the proof sheet, there is room ; and I insert it here, for the sake of preserving it to future times. It is what will be called a very devout prayer, by " His Most Christian Majesty," the king of France, on the occasion of the baptism of his young grand-nephew, the Duke of Bordeaux :—" Let us invoke for him the protection of the Mother of God, the queen of the angels ; let us implore her to watch over his days, and remove far from his cradle the misfortunes with which it has pleased providence to afflict his relatives, and to conduct him by a less rugged path than I have had, to eternal felicity." This act of devotion was *performed*, not a fortnight ago, by the sovereign of the most enlightened Popish kingdom in the world. Here there is no God acknowledged but a mere creature ; and if such idolatry shall be persevered in, it is probable that the young prince, if spared as long in the world, will have to go over a still more " rugged path" than that of his predecessor.

THE

# Protestant,

No. CXLIX.

---

SATURDAY, MAY 19th, 1821.

---

I HAVE still some accounts to settle with my long forgotten opponent, AMICUS VERITATIS, though after the exposure which I have made of the character of Popery, any farther notice of his errors may be considered almost a work of supererogation. It is necessary, however, that I keep my word, and therefore I must devote a Number or two, to his service.

I observe, then, in the first place, that I have found him out to be a great literary thief. I have already shown that part of his declamation about good works was stolen, without acknowledgment, from a recent English publication. (see PROT. No. 121.) And I have made such farther discoveries as lead me to doubt whether he did not pilfer the greater part of what he gave as his own. In a letter which he published in the Glasgow Chronicle, dated 25th June, 1818, (see PROT. Vol. I. Part I. page 36.) we read as follows :—" If frequency of repetition could give to misrepresentation the substance of truth, an indulgence would be of all scandalous things the most scandalous. Your correspondent seems to have adopted this principle ; he conceives he may justly assume the privilege of saying what has been said by hundreds before him, and, therefore, without hesitation, condemns the practice of indulgences, in terms the most pointed and severe." Now this passage is stolen verbatim, without marks of quotation, from a pamphlet, entitled, " A Vindication of the Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham." 1807. p. 42. with only this alteration, to wit, Amicus strikes out " the Bishop of Durham," and puts " your correspondent," that is THE PROTESTANT,



in his place, which, if it were not mere words, would be a very comfortable *translation* for the said PROTESTANT; though both church and state would be losers, if a prelate so truly venerable and estimable were to be superseded by a mere layman of the North.

AMICUS then proceeds to proclaim his own courage, in the following terms:—"But I am not to be intimidated by a sourness of aspect: the shafts of ridicule will not in the least discompose me, and I can despise the meanness of sophistical reasoning, whilst I pity the prostitution of talent." What pity that so bold a man was so soon put to silence! and that too, by a writer so contemptible as to prostitute his little talent for the purpose of mere sophistical reasoning. Surely it would have been easy to refute such a writer; and though Amicus was denied access to the Chronicle, after I had withdrawn, he might have found means to publish his reply to the Protestant in some other way.

But we must come to matters of more importance. He said he had "endeavoured to prove that it never was a doctrine of the Catholic Church that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin." When I first used the word "indulgence," I did it in the common English acceptance of the term,—“to grant, or be favourable to;” and there is scarcely a page of my work from the commencement, in which it is not shown that Popery is favourable to the commission of sin, either by connivance or encouragement, or positive enactment. But I am aware that in the language of Popish catechisms the word indulgence has a technical meaning somewhat different; though the consequence remains the same as that with which I charged it. When a man knows beforehand that he can purchase from his priest, a remission of the temporal and purgatorial punishment of his sins, the natural consequence must be, that he entertains no great dread of sin; and the indulgence operates as an encouragement to the commission of it; especially when it is considered, that exemption or relief from purgatory, necessarily implies exemption from hell, insomuch that he who obtains a plenary indulgence, entertains no dread of any future punishment.

But call it indulgence, dispensation, or what you will, the evil of which I complain, is, granting permission to do what is sinful. Of this the Church of Rome is notoriously guilty, for proof of which I need not go farther back than the recent bull of the Pope, which was given in my last Number but one, in which power is granted to dispense with certain laws, with regard to the marriage of persons nearly related to one another. Such marriages are either sinful, or they are not; if not, why are they prohibited; and if they are sinful, the Pope's authoritatively allowing them, is permission to commit sin. AMICUS triumphantly asserts, that if

the Popish bishops could have granted indulgence to commit sin, Henry VIII. had never professed himself a Protestant; but I cannot suppose my opponent to be so very ignorant as not to know this was the very thing that led to that event. Henry, when scarcely come to years of discretion, married his brother's widow. This was an unlawful, and a sinful thing in ecclesiastical reckoning; but he had a dispensation from the Pope for doing it. Afterwards he had some real or affected qualms of conscience, on account of what he considered an incestuous connexion. He applied to the Pope to dissolve the marriage, which he durst not do for fear of offending the emperor, who was the queen's brother: but he offered Henry another dispensation, namely, that he might have two wives. (See PROT. Vol. I. Part I. page 32.) Gross as Henry's notions of morality were, he was not bad enough for this; and finding that the Pope would not comply with his request, he threw off his yoke altogether, which was perhaps the wisest thing he ever did.

Amicus Veritatis attempts to evade the evidence which I had adduced of the great wickedness of his church in the article of indulgences, by doubting some of my facts, and denying others. "The doctrines or theses of Tetzel," says he, "were publicly condemned by the Pope's nuncio, Miltitz, and consequently cannot be Catholic doctrine;" for the truth of which he refers me to Mosheim and others. From the following extract the reader will judge how far this is correct: speaking of Miltitz's conference with Luther, we are informed that Miltitz "loaded Tetzel with the bitterest reproaches, on account of the irregular and superstitious means he had employed for promoting the sale of indulgences, and attributed to this miserable wretch all the abuses that Luther had complained of. Tetzel, on the other hand, burdened with the iniquities of Rome, tormented with a consciousness of his own injustice and extortions, stung with the opprobrious censures of the new legate, and seeing himself equally despised and abhorred by both parties, died of grief and despair. This incendiary being sacrificed as a victim to cover the Roman Pontiff from reproach, Miltitz entered into a particular conversation with Luther, at Altenburgh, and, without pretending to justify the scandalous traffic in question, required only, that he would acknowledge the four following things: 1st, That the people had been seduced by false notions of indulgences: 2dly, That he (Luther) had been the cause of that seduction, by representing indulgences as much more heinous than they really were: 3dly, That the odious conduct of Tetzel alone had given occasion to these representations: and 4thly, That though the avarice of Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, had set on Tetzel, yet that this rapacious tax gatherer had exceeded by far the bounds of his commission." *Mosheim by MacLaine, Cent. xvi. §. 1.*

Now, here is not a word that implies a condemnation of Tetzel's indulgences, but only of Tetzel himself. Like other doers of dirty work, he had overdone his part, and brought disgrace upon his superiors and employers. The bull was given under the authority of the Pope himself, the words of which are given in the first volume of *THE PROTESTANT*, Part I. page 16. This Miltitz had no right or power to condemn, and he does not profess to condemn it. If he had, he must have published another bull for undeceiving the many thousands whom Tetzel had deceived. But nothing of the kind was done. The people were allowed to believe in the efficacy of the indulgence which they had received and paid for; and there is not so much as a hint that the benefit of it was effected by the irregular and superstitious means which had been used for promoting the sale.

My second proof was a letter or bull of indulgence granted by the present Pope to the people of Cork. Amicus considers this so trifling and inapplicable as hardly to require notice; but the fact is, he could not notice it in the way I called the reader to do, without divulging the truth, that that very indulgence was a permission to commit sin, for it calls itself a "plenary indulgence," and "in form of a jubilee." Let Amicus inform the reader in what manner the Papists in Ireland celebrate their jubilees, and the question will be set at rest: unless, indeed, the principle avowed by a Papist to the writer of the letter in my last Number, be admitted; namely, that drunkenness and licentiousness of every description are not sins when committed on a saint's day, or day of jubilee.

Amicus writes in the true spirit of Jesuitism. When a document is produced that bears hard upon his church, he holds up a face of brass, and boldly calls it a forgery, though he had never seen or heard of it before. This is the case with the bull of the Pope, inciting the Irish Papists to murder their Protestant neighbours, which I quoted from *State Trials*. (See Vol. I. Part I. page 17.) This document, as I have already said, was produced on the trial of Lord M'Guire, one of the rebels, and its authenticity was not questioned by either the court or the prisoner. Both the fact and the document were new to Amicus Veritatis: and he found no reply to such confounding evidence, but by applying the rule which Papists have always at hand; that is, a broad denial, or charge of forgery. "Respecting the bull of Pope Urban VIII." says he, "the style and language in which it is couched assure me that it must be a forgery. Its very date increases my suspicion." Here Amicus leaves the subject, and raises a great hurricane of words about persecution; which makes it very evident that he knew nothing of the matter; but he had the presumption to imagine that his bare word, written in ignor-



ance, would be sufficient to set aside the recorded evidence of the court of King's Bench ! this is a piece of impudence which the Pope himself could scarcely match, even with infallibility at his back,—I say, Amicus was writing in ignorance. This is very evident from his mode of expression. The style and language *assured* him that it was a forgery ; but after being assured, we find him only *suspecting* ; and the date of the bull *increased* his suspicion. Now as for style, it was given in English, and it would of course partake of the manner of the translator ; and its date was May 25th, 1643. It remains with Amicus to show cause why a document of this date should not be received as authentic.

As if doubtful that his charge of forgery in this individual case would not be believed, Amicus makes the following general, and sweeping accusation, believing, no doubt, that if he got this to go down, all the documents I should ever produce would go for nothing :—" Who would take a review, from the year 1577, to the year 1684, that would not shudder at the horrific scenes that were the consequences of accumulated forgeries ? It was this detestable habit of fabrication and lies, in your chief reformers, which drew from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Whitaker, a Protestant divine, the following remarkable confession :—' Forgery,' says he, ' appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism ; originally coming forth as a kind of leprosy upon the brow of Presbyterianism in Scotland, it was conveyed by the intercourse of vice to the profligate head of the church of England.' *Whitaker, Vol. III. p. 49.*" This, the reader will perceive, is nothing but mere rant and general assertion. Amicus does not so much as pretend to confirm his charge against our chief reformers by adducing a single fact ; and they must be credulous indeed, who will take his bare word as sufficient to set aside the testimony of numerous cotemporaries who have borne witness to the integrity as well as the intrepidity of the chief reformers, both in England and Scotland. Amicus may assert that John Knox was a coward ; but most persons, instead of making a serious reply, would despise his folly, and laugh at his impudence. Yet the assertion would be every whit as true as that our chief reformers were addicted to lying and forgery. I defy the whole host of Jesuits to prove the fact with regard to any one, whom British Protestants have been accustomed to regard with veneration as instrumental in effecting the glorious work of overthrowing Popery, and establishing true religion. I do not deny that numerous Jesuits, in both Scotland and England, assumed the name of Protestants, and made a trade of lying and forgery, with a view to obstruct the progress of the reformation ; and it was one of their main tricks to lay their own crimes to the charge of Protestants, so that some late writers,

affecting to believe antiquated calumnies, have taken upon them to accuse the reformers of the vices of their enemies.

Amicus lays great stress upon the confession of Whitaker, who it seems was a Protestant; but the reader does not require to be informed, that there are, and have been, many Protestants, who maintained the hostility of Papists against the spiritual Christianity, and strict discipline of the first reformers, especially of the Scotch Presbyterians. Such men will condemn Popery as a system, on account of the political mischiefs which it occasions; and on this account they are far enough from being Papists; but they will gladly join with Papists or infidels, for the purpose of throwing discredit or ridicule on the character of men who were holier than themselves, and who would not have acknowledged such as they for brethren. Such seems to have been this Whitaker. He was not a Papist, for he did not worship the Virgin Mary; but he chose another Mary as an object of almost equal idolatry; namely, the unfortunate Queen of Scots; and he was as ready to break a lance with any man who should doubt of her purity, as Loyola was with any one who denied the immaculate conception. Dr. Mc'Crie has, in few words, justly characterised this writer as "the fantastical Whitaker, a late author who has equalled any of his predecessors in prejudice, and exceeded them all in the illiberal and violent abuse with which he has treated the most respectable of his opponents." In the style of this writer, "Knox was a fanatical incendiary—a holy savage—the son of violence and barbarism—the religious Sachem of religious Mohawks." He styles Buchannan, "a serpent—a daring calumniator—leviathan of slander—the second of all human forgers—and the first of all human slanderers." Dr. Robertson he calls "a disciple of the old school of slander—a liar—and one for whom bedlam was no bedlam." *See Life of Knox, Vol. II. pp. 153, 257. notes.* I suppose the reader will set down Whitaker himself for a raving bedlamite, and attach to his assertion no authority whatever: but it is of more consequence to know the fact, that Mr. Malcom Laing, in his dissertation on Queen Mary's accession to Darnly's murder, appended to his History of Scotland, has shown that every one of the documents represented by Whitaker as forged, is genuine.

I had given the Popish doctrine of indulgences, from the French Catechism, translated by Dr. Bogue, of Gosport; on this Amicus remarks: "I am not astonished that Bogue's Catechism was the one which your correspondent has selected for his purposes. This is a work which was translated from the original French, by a Protestant, merely for the purpose of exercising his talent of ridicule, and it was natural to suppose that your correspondent would apply to such a valuable source of misrepresentation." Here again we see that Papists hold it for certain, that no Protestant is to be

trusted, even in the simplest matters. It does not appear that Amicus had ever seen the Catechism in question, or that he had compared the translation with the original; but merely because the translator is a Protestant, it *must* of course be a "source of misrepresentation." This, I suppose, furnishes an index to the state of morals among Papists. They know their own tricks, and those of one another, so well, that they take every man for a knave.

"There's none so ready to detect a cheat,  
As he who is a knave complete."

I have the happiness of being personally acquainted with Dr. Bogue, as many of my readers are; and I believe a man of more sturdy integrity is not to be found in the three kingdoms. I consider his personal character a sufficient guarantee for the fidelity of his translation; but though it were otherwise, no reasonable man will suppose him to be such a fool, as by a false translation, to expose himself to the detection and derision of any schoolboy who might choose to bring his work to the test. In point of fact, I have never read or heard of any man calling in question its fidelity, except Amicus Veritatis; and he does it merely upon the ground that Dr. Bogue is a Protestant. He does not attempt to point out a single error in his translation; but he gives him the praise of being more candid than *The Protestant*, and even seems to admit that he gives a just definition of what is meant by an indulgence.

Having in former Numbers (120, 121.) answered that part of Amicus' letter which relates to good works and the character of Luther, I proceed now to the next in order, (see Vol. I. Part I. page 41.) and I shall despatch what relates to indulgences before I take up any other subject. Amicus affects to find me tripping in the following sentence, with which I began one of my letters in the Chronicle:—"I know that Papists maintain that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from the temporal punishment which their sins deserve, or, at most, from the pains of purgatory." "Now, surely," says Amicus, "what Catholics maintain, constitute their tenets;" and certainly so it would, if they were honest men; and if they made a candid profession of their faith to all persons, and at all times: but it is notorious that this is not the case. Papists in Glasgow will disavow many things which were firmly maintained by Papists of old, which are still maintained in other parts of the world, and which they themselves would maintain in other circumstances, and among a less enlightened people. We are not therefore to take what they maintain in words to their Protestant neighbours, as the real tenets of their church, in opposition to the bulls of Popes, and the canons of councils; and with this explanation of what I wrote three years ago, the reader will be able to judge whether I contradicted myself, as my opponent triumphantly boasts.



I had given the real doctrine of Rome on the subject of indulgences, as laid down by St. Thomas Aquinas ; and for the sake of readers who may not possess the first part of the Protestant, I shall repeat it here. The words are few, but they are very comprehensive : “ There actually exists an immense treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds and virtuous actions which the saints have performed, *beyond what is necessary for their own salvation*, and which are therefore applicable to the benefit of others ; the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure is the Roman Pontiff, and, of consequence, he is empowered to assign to such as he thinks proper, a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes.” Amicus denies that this quotation is correct, for which, of course, there is nothing but his bare assertion. He does not so much as say what is erroneous in it ; and I suspect that he knows no more about it, than he does of Pope Urban’s bull, which he was first assured, and then suspected to be a forgery. I made the extract from the Edinburgh Encyclopedia ; and I have since found that it is *verbatim*, the same as that given by Mosheim, Cent. XII. Part II. To the rest of this paragraph I gave a very particular answer in my 18th Number, Volume I. in which I showed that the doctrine of indulgences, in its most modified form, operated as an encouragement to commit sin.

With an equally bold front, Amicus pronounces, “ The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery ” to be a forgery ; and he says, that “ to such gross and palpable forgeries a denial is all that can be expected.” It is evidently all that he had to give, though he promised more, which was never forthcoming. If this was a forgery, it was the work of Papists ; it was extensively circulated and sold among Papists ; and it was actually the standard by which, for many years, the priests were in the practice of selling absolution for the crimes specified. Protestant princes complained of it to the Council of Trent, and mentioned it as one of the abominations of Popery, on account of which they rejected the council. If it had been a forgery, this was the time for the Church of Rome to have cleared herself ; but there was not among all the fathers of the council so much impudence as Amicus has in his single person. In short, they had not the face to deny what was known to the whole world. They pretended, indeed, that Protestants had corrupted it, which was impossible, seeing it was corruption itself all over ; and to show their regard for it, the holy council put it, along with the Bible, into the *Index Expurgatorius*.

THE  
**Protestant.**

No. CL.

---

SATURDAY, MAY 26th, 1821.

---

IN my last Number, I paid my respects to AMICUS VERITATIS, and replied to several passages in his letters, which I had not particularly noticed before. It was, however, only a gleaning of passages that required the performance of this duty, as I had replied to some points very fully in the earlier part of my first volume, particularly in the Second Number, in which I exposed the imposition practised by Amicus, in garbling a passage of Luther's works, so as to make him appear to teach the lawfulness of concubinage and polygamy. In a subsequent Number, I showed that it had been the practice of Popish writers, for two hundred years to garble the same passage, in the same way, and for the same purpose; so that on the part of Amicus it was only another literary theft.

The exposure which an inspection of Luther's works enabled me to make on this occasion, made a deeper impression on the public mind, than any thing I had previously written. From long inattention to the subject, people had forgotten that Popery was a system of lies and imposition; but the example of a Papist, living in the midst of us, practising such an impudent literary fraud, had the effect of opening the eyes of many. Amicus had not the courage, after all his boasting, to attempt a reply; but it was one of the first things which the CATHOLIC VINDICATOR took up. He professed to make it the subject of his Second Number,—one of the two or three that had a pretty extensive sale; but he occupied almost the whole Number with a discussion of the law of divorce, which seemed intended to divert the reader's mind away from the imposition practised by his friend. This he

despatches in very few words, as follows :—" He (The Protestant) actually charges him (Amicus Veritatis) with *forgery* ; and for what ? Because in quoting Luther's words, he refrained from giving the *whole* sentence, and suppressed the explanation, which made the reformer's case worse." This is all that we have in the form of a direct reply to the main charge—that of garbling a man's words, to make him speak what he did not intend to speak, which I called a crime equal to *forgery* ; and these words of the Vindicator, if not a vindication of the deed, make it evident that he thinks very lightly of it ; nay, in another part of the Number, he calls it " perfectly correct and honourable," from which we may estimate the degree of credit that is due to the fidelity of his quotations. Andrews does not fall behind Amicus, in boldly asserting the thing which is not. It might have been expected, that from habit and long experience in defending Popery, he would have been able to write a credible lie ; but it seems he can not always do it, for the one which I have quoted carries its own refutation in its face. He represents Luther's explanation of his meaning, as *making his case worse* ; and yet Amicus, whose object was to make Luther's case as bad as possible, "*suppressed the explanation !*" That the thing is a lie any person may satisfy himself, by reading the passage either in the original, or in the translation in the Second Number of the Protestant ; and that the Vindicator knew it to be such, I cannot but believe, without supposing him possessed of a degree of stupidity, such as he would not thank me for ascribing to him. I will illustrate what I mean by supposing a similar case :—I maintain " that it is lawful for a man to marry two women, provided one be dead before he thinks of another." Now if any man, professing to give my words, should stop at the comma, substitute a period, and leave out the rest of the sentence, he would represent me as teaching polygamy. Then, suppose I had detected this imposition, and had charged the guilty person with it, and he in justification had pleaded, that he had only " refrained from giving the *whole* sentence, and suppressed the explanation, which made" my " case worse," what would the world think of such a controversialist ? Just what all who know the Vindicator must think of him, seeing he declares such conduct " perfectly correct and honourable."

For the sake of illustration I have put the case in the strongest light ; it is, however, a case perfectly analogous to that of Luther, which is the subject of dispute. He was speaking of the lawfulness of a man taking a second wife, *his first being alive*. In a case of obstinate desertion on the part of the wife, he says it is lawful ; but explaining himself, he says, the man must not do it by his own authority ; but must take all the regular steps which the law prescribes. The question at present is not whether



Luther's doctrine be sound or unsound ; but whether it be not gross imposition to pretend to give his doctrine in his own words, and yet leave out those which are essential to the understanding of it. This is the trick of a succession of Popish authors for more than two centuries—from Walsingham down to Amicus Veritatis, and which Mr. Andrews attempts to vindicate. Such jugglery, if it were general, would unhinge the whole frame of civil society ; and as it is unblushingly practised by Papists, Protestants ought to take care how they attach credit to any thing that they say or write.

Since I have the Second Number of the “ Catholic Vindicator” under my hand, I may as well despatch it at once, which I shall do in few words, and then return to Amicus Veritatis.

Mr. Andrews says a great many true and undisputed things about the unlawfulness of a man putting away his wife ; and he cites our Saviour's words, Mat. xix. 3—9. as if they were against both Luther and The Protestant. Now I do most certainly admit the divine authority of these words, and so, I suppose, did Luther. I believe it is not lawful for a man to *put away* his wife, and take another, except in the single case which the divine Lawgiver allows. This, I suppose, no Protestant disputes ; and therefore, the Vindicator's flourishes and harangues about it, are mere beating the air. Luther was not speaking of a man *putting away* his wife ; but of a wife's *obstinate desertion of her husband*, or refusing to dwell in conjugal duty with him. This is a case for which, so far as I recollect, there is no provision made in the New Testament ; and it would not be fair to apply to it any of the peculiarities of the ceremonial law. In as far as marriage is a civil contract, it falls to be decided by civil authority, like other matters of right and wrong, between man and man, or man and woman, according to the general rule of equity laid down in Scripture. Marriage imposes on the parties a religious obligation, under the form of an oath, or sacrament if you will, to be true to one another ; but the infidelity of the one party relieves the other : yet the relief itself is a civil right, and can be obtained in a well regulated community, only according to law ; that is by a regular process of divorce. In this case if a man does *put away* his wife, he does it according to the law of the land, and consistently with the word of God.

But the case of a wife deserting her husband, and obstinately refusing to be reclaimed, is not a case of *putting away*. The words of Christ do not apply to this at all, and as there is no rule in the New Testament for this specific case, it seems like other things of a civil and temporal nature, left to the decision of temporal authority. In the event of a divorce in this case, there is no injury done to the wife. It is only a confirmation of her own act. According to the doctrine of Luther, she was to have

the most liberal indulgence. The husband was not allowed to take advantage of a hasty thought, or fit of passion, on the part of his wife, though followed by actual running away. He was not allowed to divorce her, until she had been publicly admonished a first, second, and third time, and that in presence of the church, that there might be no doubt on the mind of any person that she was wilfully obstinate. I think the only error of Luther in this matter was, that he made divorce a sentence of the church, when it should have been of the magistrate.

At all events Luther was only laying down what he considered an equitable rule of procedure, in an extreme, and perhaps difficult case. Suppose the doctrine erroneous, and suppose there is no legal relief for man or woman in the case of the one obstinately deserting the other, Luther's believing and teaching the contrary may be considered an error in judgment, but it is no proof that he practised or taught immorality; yet this is the very thing which Papists are incessantly labouring to fix upon him, and for which they refer to that part of his works. This should satisfy every impartial person that there is no real evidence of immorality on the part of Luther, either in life or doctrine, seeing his enemies can find nothing against him, but by garbling his words, and misrepresenting his meaning.

The Vindicator objects to my translation of Luther's words, that I have used the expression *ought* not, for *could* not; and though I am ready to maintain that my rendering is in the true spirit of the original, I do not think the distinction of any importance. I will even concede to him that the sexes could not be without each other, without very deplorable consequences; and though he should rail ever so much against Luther for teaching this doctrine, I must be excused from entering more particularly upon the defence of it. My work was not undertaken for the purpose of defending the doctrines of Luther, or of any other man; but to point out the false, insidious, and malignant character of Popery. And seeing that Papists have selected Luther, above all others, as an object on which to spew out the venom of their malice, I have thought it proper to spend a few hours, both now and formerly, in exposing their wickedness to the world. The character of the great Reformer needs not the weak advocacy of my pen; but any pen may, and every pen ought to be employed in holding up to universal detestation, the arts of fraud, falsehood, and forgery, by means of which the Church of Rome has so long imposed upon, and held in bondage the nations of Europe.

There is a great deal of ribaldry in this Number of the Vindicator, which I do not choose to answer. The main object of it is, to vindicate Amicus Veritatis' misrepresentation of Luther; and having replied to this, I leave all the extraneous matter to answer for itself.

Amicus Veritatis proceeds as follows :—" Your correspondent says, that those indulgences of Luther which I adduced were solitary cases, I now ask him in short words :—Did not Luther issue more bulls than one, to absolve the Germans from their obedience to Charles V. ? Did not Calvin and Beza require the Hugunots to rebel against their sovereigns ? Did not Knox, and the Presbyterian clergy of Scotland in general, with thundering anathemas, impel their followers to shake off the dominion of the Queen Regent, and afterwards that of the unfortunate Mary ? What else were the sermons and writings of Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Poynt, and other fathers of the new religion at home, in the reign of Queen Mary, but so many decrees in favour of rebellion, and so many absolutions from the duty of allegiance ? Did not a new set of Protestant doctors, proceeding, however, upon the fundamental principle of the former, that of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and in all matters of religion, preach up, on the alleged authority of God's word, the justice and necessity of deposing and murdering their king, the gallant Charles I., and subverting the constitution ? Did not the same doctors, on the same pretended sacred authority, absolve the prisoners of war who were released to them at Brentford, from the oaths they had severally taken of not serving again in the republican army ? Did not the most famous prelates and divines of the establishment, a few years before, pretend to absolve the King himself from his sworn duty to his subjects, and the very law of nature, by deciding that he was at liberty to send his favourite minister, Strafford, to the scaffold, notwithstanding he himself was conscientiously persuaded of the Earl's innocence ? He will not now have to complain that I depend upon one or two solitary cases : let him answer these, and I can furnish him with more."

PROT. *Vol. I. Part I. page 44.*

The above, it will be allowed, has a very imposing appearance ; but the intelligent reader will perceive, that it does not *furnish a single case* of improper conduct on the part of any of the Reformers, even from Luther's time down to Charles the First's time. Amicus had furnished one case which presented Luther and his colleagues in an unfavourable light. I admitted this, (*Vol. I. Part I. page 27.*) and remarked that it was a singular and solitary instance ; and so it seems now admitted to be, for no other case of a like nature has yet been adduced by my Glasgow opponents, or their London proxy. I request the reader to observe, that putting a question is not adducing, much less proving a case ; and that, according to the laws of literary warfare, no man is obliged to prove a negative. It does not, therefore, rest with me to prove that Luther, and Calvin, and Beza, and the other reformers did *not* do the bad things here laid to their charge ; it rests with Amicus to prove that they did : at least let him bring his



accusation in a tangible form ; let him produce his evidence, and he may depend upon its being carefully sifted.

I shall endeavour to bring down this subject to Amicus' capacity in the following manner: Did not a certain professional gentleman, in a state of intoxication, oftener than once, stumble into a certain house in the Saltmarket? Did he not require the inmates to rebel against their *lawful* superiors, and take the household affairs into their own hands? Did he not, with thundering anathemas, call for the officers of police, to carry off a poor unfortunate quean who threatened to give him trouble? What were his letters to a London radical Popish editor, the associate of Wooler and Co., but so many absolutions from the duty of allegiance, unless "Catholic Emancipation" were granted in its fullest extent? I am merely supposing things; and I now ask Amicus Veritatis what he would think, if he were called upon to *disprove* all the bad things which these questions may be understood to insinuate against a third person in whom perhaps he feels no particular interest? He would give the whole a broad and indignant negative, with a much better grace than he gives to his denial of plain facts and public documents. He would say, Bring a specific accusation against the professional gentleman to whom you allude; produce your evidence and let him have a fair trial; but in the meantime let him have the privilege of a British subject—that of being counted innocent until he is proved guilty.

Now this is all that I demand on behalf of the reformers, in whom I have no particular interest, for I do not derive my faith from them; and though all the bad things insinuated against them were true, it would not affect the truth of the Protestant religion as opposed to Popery. I am entitled, however, to deny the whole indictment as laid. I deny that Luther issued more bulls than one, to absolve the Germans from their obedience to Charles V. I deny that Calvin and Beza required the Hugunots to rebel against their sovereigns; and so on, with regard to all the other counts in the libel. There are some of them, indeed, which I would deny with some explanation, some with a greater, and others with a less degree of positiveness. This denial ought not to be understood as maintaining that such crimes were not committed, for that would be the absurdity of asserting a negative, which no man can do who has not a perfect knowledge of all the words, and writings, and actions of hundreds of men who died from 150 to 300 years ago. It rests with the enemies of the reformers to prove them guilty of the crimes laid to their charge, which they have not yet done. No man can reasonably be called upon to prove their innocence. That ought, as in all other cases, to be taken for granted till there be evidence of the contrary.

It is easy to put into half a page a series of questions which it

would require a volume to answer. It is easy even for persons of a convenient conscience to assert a number of falsehoods which it may be impossible to disprove ; and hence it is that the burden of proof ought always to rest with the accuser, or maker of an injurious assertion. One may even by mistake make an erroneous assertion, which it is not easy to correct ; an instance of which occurred very lately, which I give as an example. A noble peer pleading the cause of Papists, declared that two noblemen of distinguished merit, and high in naval and military command, in the reign of Elizabeth, namely, Lords Howard and Cobham, were both Papists. This was to show that Papists might be safely admitted to places of power and trust ; and though the assertion was made in the best informed assembly in the world, there was not one prepared to set the speaker right. A writer in the *Morning Post* has since shown that both these noblemen were zealous and distinguished Protestants ; but he confesses that it cost him the labour of a whole week to find sufficient evidence of the fact. If it was so difficult to rebut an assertion made in ignorance, with regard to two of the greatest subjects in the kingdom, how much more difficult must it be to repel all that malice may invent against men so politically insignificant in their day, as were Calvin and Beza, and a host of others who are not named at all, but introduced under the general designation of the “ fathers of the new religion at home,” “ a new set of Protestant doctors ?” &c.

If I were to go into a detailed refutation of the slanderous matter contained in this paragraph of Amicus' letter, I would show, that were certain facts which he alludes to fairly stated, they would redound much to the honour of the persons whom he meant to condemn. For instance, in the case of Knox, and the Queen Regent, a fair historian would not say, that he and his colleagues, with thundering anathemas, impelled the people to shake off her dominion ; but that they did by sober reason, and reference to the first law of our nature, persuade the people to defend themselves and their wives and children against treachery and lawless violence, by the traitorous attempts of the said Queen Regent, to overpower them by means of a French army, and thereby subject the kingdom to a foreign yoke. This princes not only broke her engagements with the people once and again ; but she actually maintained the doctrine, that the promises of princes were not to be considered as binding, and that the performance of them ought not to be rigorously exacted. She and her advocates therefore have no right to complain that the people considered themselves relieved from their engagement to her, especially as their liberties and their lives were at stake ; and great credit is due to the leaders, whoever they were, who persuaded the people to such unanimity and moderation, that they were able

to maintain their privileges, with comparatively small expense of human life, which would hardly have been the case had they been under the control of factious and violent demagogues.

At the same time, I freely confess, that I think ministers of the gospel are out of their element, when they take a lead in matters of political strife. But so far as this applies to the reformers, Popery was to blame for it, as well as for all its other mischiefs. In the Church of Rome there was little learning or science of any kind but among the clergy; it was their policy to keep all this among themselves; insomuch that they were usually the best qualified to manage state affairs, as well as those of the church. The Reformation found society in this condition; and the ill taught laity, even among nobility, naturally looked up to their ministers for instruction and council as they had been accustomed to do; and the ministers, conscious of their own powers, and of the extent of their influence, believed it to be their duty to exercise such influence in the way they thought best for the good of their country. In the hand of Providence they were made the instruments of incalculable good, on account of which their names ought to be held in everlasting remembrance; but no man can tell how much more good might have been done, had there been a sufficient number of well qualified statesmen to manage state affairs; and had Knox and his colleagues attended to nothing else but preaching the gospel of the grace of God to a people, most of whom were as ignorant of it as the most benighted heathen. If, instead of troubling themselves with the affairs of a worldly kingdom, they had directed the whole force of their mighty minds against the kingdom of Satan, by preaching the gospel, and otherwise instructing the people, the result might have been a thousand times more beneficial to the state than that of their mixed labours was; because they might thus have been the instruments of effecting the more extensive prevalence of genuine Christianity among all ranks of the people, and so have established the political prosperity of the kingdom upon the surest basis.

But lest Amicus should suppose that I evade his questions, and that I shrink from a defence of the Reformers, I hereby call upon him to produce his charges in a tangible form. Let me have the very words of Luther, Calvin, Beza, Knox, Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Poynt, and all the rest whom the Churches of England and Scotland acknowledged as their chief Reformers, in which they are alleged to have taught sedition and rebellion, and I have no doubt I shall be able to show that they teach no such thing, without garbling and misrepresentation, as in the case of Luther, referred to in this Number.



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CLI.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, JUNE 2nd, 1821.  
~~~~~

I CONCLUDED my last Number by calling upon AMICUS VERITATIS to produce the very words of Luther, Calvin, Knox, and other Reformers, which, he says, were so many decrees in favour of rebellion. To allow him time for so arduous a work, I shall now commence my reply to THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, which will occupy a few Numbers; and if Amicus cannot persuade the editor of the Chronicle, or any other editor to insert his letter; and if he is unable to undertake the publication of it at his own expence and risk, he may send me the manuscript, and I shall readily give it room, if it be of moderate length, and written in a style fit to appear in THE PROTESTANT. But I give him warning beforehand, that I will not receive and publish such ridiculous bombast as that which he gave from Counsellor Philips, at the conclusion of his last letter in the Chronicle, to which I reckon this short notice a sufficient reply, and with which, for the present, I conclude my reply to Amicus himself.

WILLIAM EUSEBIUS ANDREWS, *The Catholic Vindicator*, was, in his own opinion, a great man; but he allowed THE PROTESTANT to be greater, in the proportion that Goliath of Gath was greater than David, the shepherd of Bethlehem. He set out by declaring it to be his object to "bring this champion of the Philistines to the ground." But whether it was because his own head was nearer the ground, or was heavier, or had a greater affinity with the clod, it so happened, that it reached the ground first. His *Vindicator* expired in December 1819, as described in my 80th Number, vol. II.; and exactly a year thereafter, his "*Orthodox Journal*" also became defunct. This I mention with

no small regret. It was a very useful work for me, and will be found so by any other who shall attempt to lay open the true character of Popery, because it exposed many Popish secrets which are not revealed by any other journalist. I had heard of his fame before he made his appearance on this field of battle; and it was boastfully given out by our Glasgow Papists, that a little David would soon annihilate the great Goliath.

In his first Number, (col. 3.) Mr. Andrews promised to follow The Protestant through the several counts which he had drawn up against Papists: which I suppose must mean that he intended to make a distinct reply to every thing that I had advanced against them; but in the very same Number, (col. 6.) he says, "To follow THE PROTESTANT through all his windings and flippant remarks would be impossible, without bewildering the reader." This was the Vindicator's "second thought;" and I suppose he considered it the best; for in point of fact, he did not follow me through any one subject of discussion, or fairly engage with any one series of argument. He often set down whole paragraphs of my work, with a view, as he pretended, to refute them; but his attempts at refutation, are very like what I suppose to be a charge of a troop of cavalry upon a firm square of rank and file, with fixed bayonets. Whenever they come within sword length of the bayonet's point, the horses, by a natural instinct, which is very commendable in the dumb creatures, turn about and fly as fast as their legs can carry them. This is precisely the way in which Mr. Andrews behaves with regard to almost every paragraph of the Protestant which he quotes for refutation. When we think we have him just at the point of aiming a deadly blow at the head of his enemy, in less than the twinkling of an eye, we find him scampering away after something else, and the object of his attack remains untouched.

This will appear from the following quotation from my 19th Number, and his remarks upon it in his first, col. 4—6, which I give at length, even repeating my own words, as the passage is short; and it may not be convenient for all my readers to refer to it:—"Previous, however," says Mr. Andrews, "to entering upon the first charge laid against us, I shall notice a second declaration which THE PROTESTANT makes in his 19th Number, p. 147, as follows:—

"My work was not undertaken with the view of defending the Church of Scotland, or any other church. I took my stand upon the true Protestant doctrine of the Bible, and the *Bible alone*, as the foundation of my religion; and what I find not authorised by the Bible, if it should be in the church of which I am a member, or any other, I am ready to disavow it as anti-christian. Popery had taken so fast a hold of the human mind

throughout all Europe ; it had insinuated itself so much into all the feelings, and principles, and practices of the people ; its influence has so descended from one generation to another ; and it has become so interwoven with our modes of thinking, and speaking, and acting, that I question if there be any visible organized church in the world that does not possess less or more of the antichristian leaven. When the cry shall be made, Babylon the great is fallen ! is fallen ! there will be found, perhaps, some in every church crying, alas ! alas ! for something that they have lost."

" Here," says the Vindicator, " I am ready to give THE PROTESTANT due credit for the sincerity of his professions, but I cannot speak much in praise of the accuracy of his judgment. He did not commence his undertaking with a view to defend any church ; he takes his stand upon the Bible. As to the former, I believe him. His object undoubtedly is not to defend but to *slander*. Throughout the whole of his effusions, he has slandered and calumniated the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and in this very quotation he libels the Saviour of mankind, and declares him indirectly a LIAR.—He says he takes his ' stand upon the true Protestant doctrine of the Bible, and the *Bible alone*, as the foundation of his religion.' The Bible testifies that our Saviour solemnly promised that he would establish a church which should be a light to the world, a guide to the ignorant, a city placed on a mountain ; that it should be guided by the Holy Spirit till the end of time, and that the powers of hell should not prevail against it. These solemn promises of Truth itself must convince every rational man that a church has been, *is*, and *must be*, in existence, which cannot err, and *this* church our Saviour commanded every one to *obey*, under pain of being declared a heathen or a publican ; and yet the Protestant questions ' if there be *any* visible organized church in the world that does *not* possess less or more of the antichristian leaven ; ' which is the same as to say, that there is *not* a church but *has* committed *error*, or fallen under the power of darkness ; whereas the Redeemer assures us there shall be *one* without spot or wrinkle, to the consummation of the world. Now, reader, who are we to believe ? The Protestant, or the Bible, on which he pretends to take his stand, but contradicts the plain text of it, to support a groundless insinuation. He professes to be a member of the church of Scotland, and considers it to be, ' in constitution and doctrine *nearer* the divine pattern exhibited in the Bible than *any other* established church in the world.' This is a second acknowledgment, that he does not believe the veracity of the Son of God, but makes him an assertor of falsehoods, inasmuch as he contends there is not an *infallible* church on earth, when the Scriptures says *there is*, and *shall be*



one. With this specimen of impious arrogance, need we wonder that he has perverted the tendency of the catechisms used by Catholics to instruct the ignorant, for the purpose of fixing his base charges on the Church of Rome?"

The reader is requested to trace, if he can, the connexion between my paragraph, and the Vindicator's remarks upon it. I was avowedly speaking of *visible organized* churches; and he answers me partly by referring to Christ's words to his apostles as the light of the world; partly by Christ's promise to his *spiritual invisible* church; and partly by asserting that there is *one* infallible visible church in the world, a thing that never had existence, but in the distempered brains of deceiving monks, and of those who were deceived by them.

In language sufficiently revolting for its grossness, he accuses me of contradicting the Saviour, for questioning if there be an existing visible organized church free from the antichristian leaven, which implies errors in practice as well as in doctrine. By church, in this sense, I mean such a body of professing Christians as that which existed in Jerusalem, and in Corinth, and in Antioch; or if you please, such bodies as now exist, established, or not established, in most countries in Europe. Now, I think, he who should assert of any one of these, that it is free from error in both doctrine and practice, would easily be convicted of contradicting some part of the word of God. The apostles warned the early Christians that perilous times were coming, when some should depart from the faith. Antichrist was working in their own time; and of seven churches in the Lesser Asia, who were addressed by Christ himself, through the medium of the apostle John, only two were found without blame; that is, free of antichristian leaven; but where to find two, or even one such, in the present day, I suppose nobody can tell.

The Vindicator has the impiety to ascribe to our Saviour, words which none of the evangelists have ascribed to him. "The Redeemer," says he, "assures us there shall be *one* (church) without spot or wrinkle to the consummation of the world." There is nothing like this in the New Testament; and Mr. Andrews does not say where he found it. The words, "Not having spot or wrinkle," do indeed occur in Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, chap. v. verse 27. but they are not spoken of any church on earth *till* the consummation of the world, but of the church in heaven after that period, or of that part of it which is in heaven already: that is, the heavenly spouse, which Christ shall present unto himself, a *glorious* church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but holy and without blemish. Mr. Andrews means the words to apply to the Church of Rome, as she is, and always has been, which is as great an insult to the common sense

of mankind as transubstantiation itself. It is worse than to say, that all that is pleasant and odoriferous, is to be found in raking up a dunghill. This is not a subject of argument, but a mere matter of fact, with regard to which any man may satisfy himself, by inquiring into the character of the Church of Rome, and of her members wherever they exist.

This writer proceeds with his assertions in a sort of hap-hazard way, without the least regard to truth. Thus he asserts that I profess to be a member of the Church of Scotland, though the paragraph in my 19th Number, in which he affects to find this, is perhaps the only one in my whole work in which the reader may find the contrary. I gave that church the commendation which I thought was her due, and plainly stated that I was not guilty of *self-commendation* in doing so ; from which an ordinary degree of shrewdness would have inferred that I did not belong to the northern establishment. It has been my study to advocate the Protestant cause without indentifying myself with any particular sect of Protestants ; and though I cannot say that there are no traces of any sectarian peculiarity in my work, I do venture to say, that they are very faint, and such as would not lead any Protestant church to regard me as an enemy.

The Vindicator quotes, col. 8, a long paragraph from the first Number of THE PROTESTANT, on the subject of indulgences, in which I charged the Church of Rome with monstrous cruelty, for not granting relief to suffering souls in Purgatory, without being amply paid for it ; and in which I showed that by this means she drained immense sums from the people who confided in her. Now, what does the Vindicator say in reply to this ? Why, he says nothing at all, but that if this were true, the Pope and his clergy must be very rich, whereas it is well known that they are all very poor ; nay, so very poor is the Pope himself, "that the regent of this kingdom," says Mr. Andrews, "is said to have offered him a loan of some thousand pounds sterling, to enable him to carry on his government." This would probably go sweetly down with Papists, who would be glad to hear that their holy father was in such favour with the Prince Regent, now the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland ; but Protestants know that the Prince Regent never had thousands of pounds of his own to throw away for such a purpose ; that of course he never could make such an offer to the Pontiff ; and they will believe that the thing is a mere figment of the Vindicator's own invention.

It would be easy to show that the Church of Rome did amass immense wealth by means of her indulgences and pardons, and that without calling in question the fact of the present poverty of the Pope and his clergy. Bands of robbers may levy immense

sums from travellers, and yet not be able to enrich themselves. Money gotten over the devil's back is said to be spent under his belly; and it is very possible that where thousands of idle luxurious priests are saddled upon a poor people, the former may not be able to get rich by their exactions upon the latter. With enlarging upon this subject, I think it is fair to infer, that the Vindicator admits the truth of my statement, seeing he has <sup>be</sup> <sup>out</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>o-</sup> thing else to say in reply to it.

It is an avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome, that men must, in some way or other, satisfy divine justice for themselves. This I showed to be contrary to the tenor of the gospel, in which it is declared that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto *them*, 2 Cor. v. 19. and the reason why trespasses are not imputed to men themselves, is, because they were imputed to Christ, who in the words of the apostle Peter, "bare our sins in his own body on the tree;" or in those of Paul, "God made him who knew no sin, to be sin (or a sin-offering) for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Now if our sins were imputed to Christ, and if he bare them, and gave himself to God in sacrifice for them, he either made *complete* satisfaction to divine justice, or he did not. To suppose he did not, would be to disparage the work of the divine Saviour, and effectually to reject the gospel; and if we admit, that Christ did make complete satisfaction, to say that God still required men to make satisfaction for themselves would be to ascribe injustice to Him, than which nothing can be more impious. I represented the command to believe in Christ as virtually a command to forbear attempting to satisfy divine justice for ourselves; that is, to forbear what is hopeless, and absolutely impossible; and to accept the merciful provision which God has made for our salvation by the death of his own Son. This is a salvation not only from the punishment of sin, but also from sin itself; for the end of Christ's death is, that we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; for which also provision is made by the renewing and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit, who furnishes the only means, and suggests the strongest motives for abounding in all good works. No man can think of satisfying divine justice in his own person, without looking upon God as such a one as himself; one whose justice is not very strict, and which is easily satisfied. Hence I represented Papists as having as low ideas of the divine Being as heathens who worship the work of their own hands: and Mr. Andrews confesses this to be the case with himself, if the above doctrine be true. But let us have the avowal in his own words:—

"Such are the opinions of The Protestant as to the duty of satisfying divine justice; but if *his* doctrine is not more cal-



enlated to grant leave to commit sin, than the Popish doctrine of indulgence, I confess I am one of those who have as low ideas of the divine Being, as the man who worships a stock or a stone for the Deity. It is asked by the question (in the French catechism) above quoted, if it is the intention of the Church of Rome to *free* us by indulgences from the obligation of God? (what a strange expression!) Now what is the obligation a Papist is taught he owes to God? He is to love God with his whole heart, with his whole soul, with all his strength, and with all his mind; and his neighbours as himself. From this obligation it is averred the intention of the church is *not to free* us; consequently she cannot intend either to indulge us in the committal of sin, or *command* us to commit it. On the contrary, the last answer quoted expressly declares, that she intends, by the dispensation of indulgences, to *excite more and more in the heart PIETY and LOVE of God*. The assertions, therefore, of THE PROTESTANT are paradoxical, inasmuch as the declared intentions of the Church of Rome are meant to produce the contrary tendency imputed to them by the writer."

It was that branch of the doctrine that requires men to satisfy divine justice for themselves, that I accused of gross impiety; and certainly nothing can be more hostile to piety and the love of God. The essence of true piety is obedience to the command of God. Now his command to all men is, that they repent and believe the gospel, and unless they obey in this respect, there is nothing else that God will acknowledge to be obedience; and therefore nothing of the nature of piety towards God. The belief of the gospel invariably produces a grateful acknowledgment of the grace of God in providing a Saviour for the guilty,—of the infinite love of Christ in giving himself a ransom for us; that is, laying down his own life to satisfy divine justice *for us*. The experimental knowledge of this love powerfully operates in the way of producing *all* obedience; and nothing else can do it. But the Church of Rome commands her members to satisfy divine justice for themselves; which is a command to commit sin in the highest possible sense; for it is to declare that the atonement of Christ is insufficient; it is to slight and reject the provision which infinite mercy has made for the restoration of a ruined world. It is not enough for the Church of Rome that her children are naturally enemies of God; she commands them to continue so. This is the necessary effect of disbelieving the perfection of Christ's satisfaction, by which alone sinners are reconciled to God, and made his friends: and that man must necessarily be an enemy who is unreconciled; that is, one who has yet to satisfy divine justice. In the mind of such a man there can be no right thoughts of God at all. No love, no gratitude, no

obedience. Hence it is that the minds of all true Papists are so estranged from the worship of God, and so degraded as to worship mere creatures, even the work of their own hands.

Towards the conclusion of his first Number, the Vindicator gives us an abundant quantity of hacknéyed nonsense about the doctrine of salvation by grace being unfriendly to good works and an encouragement to sin, all which was anticipated and answered by the apostle Paul in his epistle to the Romans.

I have thus made a beginning in my reply to The Catholic Vindicator; and I suspect it will be very uninteresting to my Protestant readers, partly from the repetitions which it is necessary to make; and partly from the quality of the subject, which requires me sometimes to descend below the level of polite writing, and to adopt the less dignified alternative recommended by Solomon, Proverbs xxvi. 5. I shall not quote the words, as I hope, by omitting them, to send my Popish readers to the Bible for once. I find this the most irksome duty I have been called to perform since the commencement of my work. The style and matter of the Vindicator are so low and disgusting, that I anticipate no pleasure to myself, or profit to the reader in exposing his errors and misrepresentations; but as he was the public organ of our Glasgow Papists, and, I suppose, of all the strict, genuine Papists in the kingdom, including Dr. Milner, whose patronage he enjoyed, and whose sentiments he was understood to express, it becomes necessary to pay more attention to his work than if it contained only the errors of an obscure individual.

I shall, however, relieve the tedium of my subject by inserting from time to time such light matter as may come in my way. I am indebted to a correspondent for the following counterpart of the story of the Pope's shirt, which was given in Number 148, from Galiffe's work,—not *Galiffico's*, as the word was erroneously given. The following is from the Literary Gazette of May 12th, in the account of the death and funeral of the Sultan of Souracarta, in the island of Java; and it shows that the affair of the shirt, like most other Popish customs, was derived from heathenism:

“The washing of the Sultan occupied above two hours. The water used for the purpose, and in which, for the first washing, tamarind and burnt rice straw were mixed, was taken up by the bystanders as a mark of respect. Some wash their head and body with it; others swallow a part of it. In this operation it is the duty of the eldest son to clean with a large piece of linen those parts which most require it. The linen, being afterwards cut into small pieces, is distributed among the family and bystanders, who ascribe to it a certain occult power to preserve them in all the dangers of life.”

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CLII.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY, JUNE 9th, 1821.  
~~~~~

THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR begins his third Number with the following statement :—" Some of my readers, for whose opinions I entertain a high regard, disapprove of my using the terms *papist* and *popery* ; but in this adoption I am not singular, as I only follow the example of the venerable and learned Gother in his *Pulpit sayings*, and afterwards in his *Two-fold character of Popery*, a work of general estimation among Catholics, it having passed through many editions, and is still in circulation. In Mr. Gother's time, Catholics were always designated as Papists, and at this day there are many of our adversaries, from the prelatie chair to the cobbler's stall, who will not allow us any other title. Of this description of bigots is THE PROTESTANT ; and as I am not very nice about names, so as I know the principles I defend are correct, I felt a willingness to humour my adversary, purposing, when occasion offered, to convince him, if he is open to conviction, as well as every candid Protestant who reads my VINDICATOR, that a Papist, and a Papist *only*, is entitled to the honourable distinction of *Catholic* ; and that the system of Popery, and *this system only*, is the true church on earth, established by our Saviour and his apostles. This opportunity THE PROTESTANT has given me in the following remarks made by him on a similar objection to the epithet, by one of the newspaper disputants."

He then quotes a paragraph from my second Number, in which I showed that the Church of Rome never was *universal*, and of course never entitled to the word *Catholic*. This is another matter of fact, which every reader of history knows as well as he or I ; and which scarcely admits of any argument, but a mere reference to history. Notwithstanding, Mr. Andrews makes a very long and wordy reply, the substance of which is, that the Church of Rome is entitled to the designation of Catholic,



because her members are spread all over the world ; and because she was the instrument of converting every country in *Christendom* to the Christian faith. I am by no means induced to concede to him that this last assertion is true ; but though it were, it would not bear him out, for Christendom itself is far from being Catholic or universal ; and as for the other fact, that the Church of Rome has her members spread all over the world, if that be enough to constitute her *the* Catholic church, then I maintain that Scotland is the universal empire, and Presbytery is the Catholic religion, for in what part of the world are not Scotchmen and Presbyterians to be found ? But I am afraid the Jews will contest the point with us, for they were once the true church, and they are to be found at this day in all parts of the world, even in places where Popery and Presbytery would find it difficult to obtain a settlement.

The Vindicator admits that Popery and Papists are proper designations of the Church of Rome and her members ; then it is surely unreasonable to charge with bigotry those who persist in using these proper words, and who refuse to use such as they think improper. In every controversy it is of advantage to use terms in which both parties are agreed ; and when there are such terms, he would be a bigoted controversialist who would require his opponent to use any other. It seems, however, that the Vindicator's concession on this point was not agreeable to some of his brethren ; and he justified himself by stating the fact that in Gother's time, that is, about a century and a half ago, Catholics were always designated as Papists. Luther in his commentary on the Galatians, tells us, that Papist was the name by which they themselves chose to be called, and I have never read that this was contradicted by any of his contemporaries ; but for about half a century our Scotch and English Papists have laboured hard to get themselves called Catholics ; and through the indifference of Protestants they have very generally succeeded. Now what can be the reason why the professors of an unchangeable religion should be so anxious to change its name ? for as they now call themselves Catholics, they call the system Catholicity. The fact is, the more respectable of them, mingling with Protestants, in an enlightened state of society, could not but come to know, that there were many horrible ideas associated with the words *papist* and *popery* ; and such of them as were readers of history could not but know the fact, that these ideas had their foundation in truth ; hence they were led first to disavow the name, and to assume one less offensive ; and one, which being recognized in a creed approved by Protestants, they thought would commend them to favour in a Protestant country.

The bulk of this more respectable class of Romanists, differ from genuine Papists in many respects, though they are willing to be called by the same general name, Catholic. Though they all

profess to hold fellowship with the Pope as the head of their church, there is as real a schism between them as between any two sects of Protestants. Their nobility and gentry in England, associating with Protestants of the same rank, have insensibly acquired a refinement, and in some instances a liberality, quite unknown to men of their communion in former times, and in countries where their religion is still predominant. They are conscious that they are not the savage, superstitious beings that all history represents Papists to have been, and which they know them still to be, in Spain, Portugal, and Italy. Hence, along with the name, Popery, they have renounced a great deal of the thing; and some of them go so far as to proclaim their dissent from the Church of Rome as papistical, and profess to adhere to it under a less objectionable character, which is virtually to give up its infallibility. But Mr. Andrews takes his stand upon the system of Popery, as it was, is, and shall be, while it exists. He has on his side at least one Vicar apostolical bishop, most of the inferior priests, all the Jesuits, and almost all the common people; and he writes against the liberal and respectable part of his own communion with as much abuse and virulence as he did against THE PROTESTANT.

I shall confirm what I have said above by the authority of a doctor of their own, and, I suppose, the most learned man that has risen among them for a hundred years. Addressing one of his own bishops, Dr. Geddes says:—"The enlightened and well principled Catholic,' your lordship observes, 'remains unshaken and unseduced.' Certainly, my lord. But who is the *enlightened* and *well-principled Catholic*? This is yet to be demonstrated. The CATHOLIC religion not only permits its children to be dutiful subjects, but expressly commands them to be such: but not so, my lord, the POPISH religion. These two ought never to be confounded. The former is a most amiable matron, who inculcates nothing upon the minds of her children but the peaceful maxims of the gospel; the latter is an ambitious termagant, who has often encouraged her children to commit almost every sort of crime. It was the *Popish*, not the *Catholic* religion, my lord, which (not to go out of our own country, nor back to a remote period) could in 1537 excite 20,000 men under the conduct of a monk, to rise in rebellion against Henry VIII. in consequence of his subjects having been freed from their oaths of allegiance by a bull of Paul III. It was the same *Popish* religion that, in 1539, attempted to depose the same King, and place on the throne the Dean of Exeter.\* It was this religion that sent Radulpho into England in 1568 for the vile purpose of corrupting the loyalty of the English Catholics, and to pave the way for the famous bull of Pius V. which deprived Queen Elizabeth of

\* Afterwards Cardinal Pole.

her title, dominion, dignity, and privileges ; and forbade all her subjects, under pain of *anathema*, to obey her ! It was this religion that, the very next year, again erected the standard of sedition under the ears of Northumberland and Westmoreland ; and their want of success the Popish Surrius thinks, might have been owing to this, *that the Papal denunciation had not been sufficiently made known to all the Catholics*. It was this religion that in 1580, sent Parsons and Campion into England, with the qualified bull of Gregory XIII. which, in the hands of those two artful men, was deemed a surer means of raising a rebellion, than the more violent one of his predecessor. It was this religion that in 1588 sent the Spanish Armada to invade England, fraught with a powerful army, plenty of money, and treasures of indulgences, for the purpose of dethroning a queen, against whom Sixtus V. had confirmed all the censures of Pius and Gregory ; and granted a full pardon to all who should embark in the holy enterprize ! In short, my lord, I make no hesitation to affirm, that the *Popish* (not the *Catholic*) religion has been, mediately or immediately, the cause of almost all the political disturbances in Europe since the days of Gregory VII. It is against this religion, my lord, that we CATHOLIC \* DISSENTERS protest ; and whose interests ye Vicars apostolic appear to be contending for." See *Life of Dr. Geddes, by John Mason Good, London, 1803, pages 229—231.*

Such is the true testimony of the most learned Romanist of the present age. He plainly declares that the religion of which the Pope was the head, was the cause of almost all the mischiefs which afflicted Europe for ages ; and that the head of the church himself was the chief instigator of sedition and rebellion. Yet with a wonderful degree of inconsistency, he continued a priest of that church, acknowledging the Pope as his spiritual father, but intreating that he might not be called by his odious name : and the name which he chose for himself was so general, that it could not properly distinguish him from any other person professing Christianity, or his church from any other church called Christian. It is pretended to remedy this defect by adding another word ; and so Papists are generally styled by Protestants, *Roman Catholics*, which implies a contradiction something like, *particular general or limited universal*.

It is enough for my present purpose to have it acknowledged by Mr. Andrews, that it is *Popery* that he is defending, and to have it certified by a priest of his own communion, that this

\* He means dissenters from the Church of England, and by the word *Catholic*, he distinguishes himself and brethren from Protestant dissenters ; but the bishop whom he addressed strongly objected to the expression, declaring that Catholics were not dissenters from the Established Church, but truly and properly the church itself.



system of popery has been the cause of unspeakable mischief to all the nations of Europe. The extracts which I have made from both these authors, will be found, I hope, to bear me out in what I have long been maintaining,—that Popery is the proper designation of the Romish system; and that this Popery is the convicted enemy, not only of real Christianity, but also of all that is amiable and virtuous in the world.

In treating this subject, the Vindicator writes as follows:—  
 “ In the first place our Redeemer singled out Peter as the rock on which he founded his *church*, and he assured his disciples that *this church should exist to the end of the world*, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. Here then we have a *visible church*, fixed upon an immoveable basis, and in a distinguishable situation, defying the attacks of *error* and the malice of *devils*, to the end of time. In the second place, our blessed Lord chose twelve poor men, whom he commissioned to go to the farthest bounds of the earth, to teach all nations the truths and precepts he had imparted to them, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and commanding all men, under pain of eternal damnation, to hear and obey the church which they should establish. Accordingly, on the commencement of their mission, they formed a creed, called the apostle’s creed, which was to be a symbol of the faith of themselves and of their followers for ever; and we find them in their acts, recorded in the New Testament, exercising that authority over the new converts which Christ had given them, when he said, ‘ he that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.’ Here then we have an organized church, and that it was both *visible* and *organized*, is placed beyond a doubt, by the following words of St. Matthew, Chap. xviii. ver. 15, 16, 17, 18.”

Here we have the old figment of Peter being the rock on which Christ built his church, asserted with as much confidence as if the absurdity of it had never been demonstrated. This said rock, that is Peter, is declared to be an immoveable basis, against which the gates of hell, that is, the attacks of hell, and the malice of devils should never prevail; and yet we find, in the very same chapter (Mat. xvi.) in which Papists affect to find that Peter is the rock, that he is exhibited by the inspired penman, as a mere reed, shaken by the wind; nay, it is declared that Satan had so far prevailed against him, and had got him to enter so far into his views, that the divine Saviour found it proper to call him by the name of the adversary to whose suggestions he had given a too willing ear:—“ Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.” A feeling of tenderness for the apostle, who was upon the whole a good and honest man, has led many

readers of the Bible to suppose that such hard words were not spoken to Peter, but to the devil, who had somehow got the possession of his mind, and the command of his tongue ; but there is no foundation for this tenderness. It was Peter himself, and none else, who at that time was called Satan, that is, adversary ; for he was not a demoniac, or one possessed by a demon, who spoke through his organs, without the consent of his own mind. It was of his own deliberate judgment that he presumed to rebuke his divine Master, and to advise him not to submit to the shame and the pain of being crucified. In plain words, his advice went to dissuade Christ from finishing the work of our salvation on which he had entered. In this he acted the part of a very Satan, or adversary of both God and man ; and this too, after that had taken place which Papists understand to have constituted him the immoveable rock against which the gates of hell should never prevail. It is painful to be obliged to advert to the fact, that even after this, the devil prevailed against this apostle once and again ; but Papists by exalting him above measure, and putting him in the place of God, lay us under the necessity of showing that he was but a man.

The next thing of importance which the Vindicator asserts, is, that the apostles, on the commencement of their mission, formed a creed, called the apostle's creed, which was to be a symbol of the faith of themselves and of their followers for ever. Where he obtained this piece of information he does not say. I find, indeed, in the Douay catechism, after the question, Who composed the creed ? Answer, The twelve apostles. But the Douay doctors were such moderns that they could know no more of the matter than we do. I have before me a large volume, intitled, *The History of the Apostle's Creed*, fourth edition, London, 1719, in which I find no evidence that the apostles were the authors of this comprehensive, and I must say, truly orthodox symbol. It contains just twelve articles, from which, I suppose, it is to be inferred that each apostle contributed one. The work to which I have referred does not assert this, but gives it as an ancient opinion, " That the apostles were the real authors of the creed, and that they assembled together by their mutual consent to compose and frame it." *page 8.* The author shows that there is no foundation for this ; and indeed to suppose that the apostles of Christ, who had so much important work upon their hands, should be gathered together from the different parts of the world, to compose a short summary of what any man of common understanding might find in their published epistles and narratives, appears to me no less absurd than to suppose that twelve of the most learned men in Europe should be assembled in solemn council, to decide upon the best means of making a pen, which every scribe is, or ought to be, able to do for himself. System-

atizing was no part of the work of either apostles or prophets. There is a divine simplicity in their mode of communicating heavenly instruction, which corresponds with the other works of God ; and as no one field, or cavern of the earth exhibits a classified arrangement of minerals or plants, so no works of inspired men was intended to give us a systematical, or classically arranged view of Christian doctrine. I find no fault with any man for endeavouring to classify and arrange the truths of the word of God, for the edification of himself or others, but let it be always regarded as a work of man, and not ascribed to the divine Spirit, or those who wrote under his infallible influence.

I admit that this short summary of doctrine is unexceptionable in itself, if taken with the explanatory note of the Westminster divines about Christ having descended into hell, which explanation, by the by, shows how difficult it is to draw up a summary of religious belief on which all Christians shall agree. The articles of this creed are so few and simple, that it must have been composed before controversies were greatly multiplied ; and those who framed it were no doubt agreed about the meaning of the clause, "he descended into hell;" but in process of time this itself became a subject of controversy; one party maintaining that Christ after his death, went down to the place of punishment, —another, that the words signify only that he went down to the grave, that is, was buried, and continued for a time in the state of the dead. It is not doubted that this creed is a composition of great antiquity. The whole of it as it stands in the English Liturgy, was generally received as an authoritative confession in the fourth century ; but the word "Catholic" was not originally in it, as is admitted by Rufinus who wrote a commentary on it about the end of that century. This word must have been foisted in to serve a purpose, after the Church of Rome had begun to put forth her claim to be obeyed as the mother and mistress of all churches : and though the word is retained in all the Protestant versions of this creed, I do not see how they can make sense of it, consistently with their other avowed principles, otherwise than by applying it to the spiritual church or spouse of Christ, which is not of this world but saved out of it ; that is, washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God. This church is Catholic, not considered as pervading the whole world, but as comprising the whole company of those who are saved, out of all kindreds, and tongues, and people, and nations.

That the Catholic Church must be *visible* and *organized*, the Vindicator attempts to prove from Christ's words, Mat. xviii. 15—18. "Tell it unto the church," &c. "From this explicit command of Christ to his disciples," says Mr. Andrews, "to have recourse to the church, in the event of any dispute or division



arising among them, it is demonstrably evident that there must be a *visible organized church* on earth having power to *decide* all questions referred to her, and her decision, in every instance, was to be *final* and *binding* on *all* believers, under pain of being considered an outlaw or an *unbeliever*, and consequently no longer a *member of the true church.*" col. 37. Now it is very clear that our Lord's words, even with the Vindicator's comment upon them, prove the very reverse of what he means to establish. When Christ says, "Tell it to the church," he certainly means such a church as a man could speak to, which is impossible of the Romish, or any other church that pretends to be Catholic or universal. The command is perfectly intelligible, and obedience to it was practicable and easy in any church which apostles founded, and in which the earlier bishops presided. But none of these churches pretended to be universal. The assumption of this title distinctly points out the Church of Rome as not being such a church as Christ was speaking of; for it is impossible to tell any thing to such a body, not even in the sense of a representative church, if we were to admit this meaning of the word, for she has had neither council nor convocation for 300 years; and therefore, according to her own doctrine, she can have given no decision during that period, that is "binding upon believers." Perhaps Mr. Andrews will allege that telling a thing to the priest is enough; but he has a great deal to do before he can prove that a priest is the church; or that all the priests together are entitled to this honourable appellation.

The Vindicator blunders away through many a long page, applying to one thing what Christ and the apostles spoke of another;—such for instance as the promises that the church should be preserved in the world till the end of time, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. This is what no Christian disputes; and yet Mr. Andrews constantly writes as if I denied it. Thus because the Culdees and Waldenses were overcome by the Church of Rome, he argues that they were not *the true church*. The same thing will apply to the churches in Jerusalem, in Samaria, in Judea, Galatia, and the lesser Asia. We are sure these were true churches, yet most or all of them have been overcome and destroyed; yet the promise of Christ has been, and shall most certainly be fulfilled in all its extent. Plain facts therefore assure us, that this promise was not given to any particular church; that it does not insure perpetual existence to any one of them; but only to his church in that sense in which it is general, comprehending all real Christians in every age and country in the world. If I have succeeded in establishing this to the reader's satisfaction, I have answered the half of the Vindicator's great volume.

THE  
**Protestant.**

No. CLIII.

~~~~~  
SATURDAY JUNE 16th, 1821.  
~~~~~

By wresting my words, and making what I wrote of *a* church in one sense of the word apply to *the* church in another sense of it, the Catholic Vindicator affects to find me guilty of innumerable contradictions ; and he triumphs mightily in the victory which he supposes he has obtained. I can scarcely allow myself to set this down to the account of mere stupidity ; for though my opponent had never read the New Testament, he must have seen from some of my earliest papers, that I made the distinction to which I have here alluded. He might indeed question the propriety of the distinction, but seeing I laid it so plainly down, he must have been perfectly aware, that whatever my errors, in his opinion, were, the things which he calls contradictions were made such by himself, by perverting my words.

This general reply may serve for all that he has written about my “endless contradictions,” a charge which is reiterated through almost every Number of his work. He was aware that he was writing for people who would readily swallow any thing that might have the appearance of being a defence of their superstition, or that would place its great enemy in an odious light. Besides, as his main object was to draw me away from the vital parts of the controversy, and to engage me in a quibbling personal contest, he made the bait as tempting as possible, by the grossness of his accusations, and the unfair use of my words, expecting that I would instantly and eagerly defend myself against his attacks. Had I done so, I should never have got a step farther in exposing the errors and abominations of Popery. I would soon have

disgusted my readers, as he did his, by personalities and other unprofitable discussions, and for want of support, my work, like his, would have lingered with difficulty to the end of a single volume.

In the 4th Number of the *Vindicator*, we have some paragraphs of *THE PROTESTANT*, in which the design and tendency of Popery are contrasted with the design and tendency of Christianity; and which conclude with the following sentence:—"With regard to the destruction of men's bodies, we know from history that Popery has slain its thousands and tens of thousands; but with regard to the ruin of souls from this fatal error, (that of depending upon something else than Christ's death) no man can tell the millions who have been by Popery deceived, to their everlasting destruction." See the whole passage, *PROT.* Vol. I. page 172.

Let us now hear the reply which the *Vindicator* makes to this passage:—"Poor Popery! if this description of thy case be true, what must thy votaries expect at the last accounting-day? The picture is really horrible to behold, and even *THE PROTESTANT*, in contemplating it, is fearful that some of his readers will condemn him for colouring it too much; for he adds, 'I am aware that I am here treading on delicate ground, and that many who take themselves for Protestants, will accuse me of uncharitableness, but I care not, while I know that I am upon sure ground, which I consider myself to be, while I proceed upon the plain declaration of the word of God.' Presumptuous man! before advancing so frightful a charge against the most numerous body of Christians throughout the universe, in all ages, oughtest thou not to have searched into the principles of their religion, from the writings and instructions given by their own pastors and doctors, rather than from the disfigurations of their enemies?" col. 55. Then follows a morsel of verbal criticism on the word "*consider*," in one part of a sentence, which it seems is not strong enough to correspond with the word "*know*" in another, in which, perhaps, the *Vindicator* is right for once. After this he finds that if my representation be true, Papists are "bloody and unfeeling murderers and cut-throats;" which inference I shall not dispute with him. Again, if such were Popery, "how are we to account for its triumphing over the works of darkness, by supplanting the heathen rites of Paganism, and planting the cross of Christ in their stead; and this, not by sacrificing other men's lives, but by its agents and dupes laying down their own, when persecuted to death by their adversaries?" Thus by putting a question, he takes for granted the very point at issue; for if Popery had triumphed over the works of darkness, I should have no argument against it; and it is well known that instead of



*supplanting*, Popery *adopted* the rites of heathenism ; and planting the cross in the Popish sense, is setting up as great an idol as ever heathen worshipped. I merely state this here ; but I refer to the numerous proofs of Popish idolatry which I gave in my first and second volumes, from Number 39 to 62.

The Vindicator, of course, denies that Satan is the author of Popery ; and then he proceeds, questioning as follows, in which he still takes for granted the very thing that is disputed :—" If the *design* of Popery originated with Satan, is it probable, is it reasonable, to suppose that God would permit its influence to extend over the *whole* of Christendom ; nay, that Christianity itself should owe its rise to this very influence ?" We have been accustomed to think that Christianity owed its rise to the mercy of God ; but no, says Mr. Andrews, *Christianity owes its rise to the influence of Popery!* Then Popery, as I have all along maintained, is not Christianity, but something different from it, for a thing cannot take its rise from itself ; and, farther, Popery must have been before Christianity, for a thing cannot rise out of that which comes after it. Here I will admit that the Vindicator is right once more. Popery, as I had been showing, owes its origin to the devil. He infused the very essence of it into the minds of our first parents when he persuaded them to disbelieve God, and to believe a creature. This, I say, is the concentrated essence of Popery as it exists in the world at this day. This was before Christianity ; and it is so far true that Christianity took its rise from it, that it furnished occasion for the display of divine mercy, by the promise of a Saviour, in which Christianity originated.

But to proceed with the Vindicator's catechism,—for Popish writers have all a trick of putting what they mean to affirm into the form of a question, insomuch that some of them cannot understand a series of questions otherwise than as so many assertions ; thus when I put a few questions to Amicus Veritatis by way of supposition, (Number 150. p. 366.) I have been understood by Papists, as I am informed, as affirming something about Amicus himself. Had this been the case I would not have said, " I am *merely* supposing things ;" for I hold it to be as sinful to write as to speak a lie. I know nothing whatever of him personally ; and if he has suffered any injury among his brethren or others, by the misapprehension of my words, I hope this declaration will do it away. But to proceed :—" Were not our Saxon ancestors converted to Christianity by the missionaries of Rome ? Do we not owe the principal privileges enjoyed by Protestants under the British constitution to Catholic or Popish kings, prelates and people ? Were not all the infidel nations that received the faith of Christ converted by the agents of Popery ?"—and so on to

the end of the paragraph. Now it is evident that the *Vindicator* intends these questions to stand for affirmations ; but there is not one of them founded in truth : Rome did not convert our Saxon ancestors to Christianity, but to Popery ; and Gregory, the Pope of the day, instructed his missionaries not to abolish the Pagan rites of the Saxons, but to adopt them, which Christianity would never have done. It is not true that we owe our principal privileges to Popish kings, prelates and people ; for the greatest of all these privileges is liberty of conscience, which was never enjoyed under a Popish king, and scarcely enjoyed at all with any degree of security in this kingdom till the Revolution of 1688, when the government became decidedly Protestant, and a Papist was declared incapable of sitting on the throne. As for the infidel nations which Rome boasts of having converted, it is well known that their conversion consisted in little else than a change of one set of idols for another.

In all that the *Vindicator* has said on this subject, there is nothing that has so much as the appearance of a reply to my paragraph about the bloody cruelty of the system which I am opposing. The amount of what he has written in opposition to my statement, is, If this be true, Popery is cruel indeed ; but he has not a word to prove that it is not true ; and he cannot, he knows that he cannot, disprove my statement, for they are recorded in letters of blood, visible to every man who reads the history of Europe for the last six hundred years. Instead therefore of meeting the charge of bloody cruelty which I brought against his church, by disproving or confessing it, he calls away his reader's attention to many fine things which he pretends Popery has done ; as if a man charged with murder should plead not guilty, because he had given a penny to every beggar whom he had met on the street for the last two years. I suppose no jury would acquit a convicted murderer on this account ; neither can I acquit the Church of Rome of bloody cruelty, because her defenders plead that she has done some good in the world, while they cannot prove even this on her behalf.

The *Vindicator* is so extremely diffuse and *wordy* in all his discussions, that I am in some instances under the necessity of abridging. I know he will find fault with this ; and I know also that I would not satisfy him by quoting any of his paragraphs entire, unless I were to quote them all, that is, transfer his whole volume into mine, which would be rather a hazardous undertaking, for I am persuaded the buoyance of The Protestant would not be able to preserve the united mass from sinking into contempt and oblivion. The reader may however rest assured that what I give as quotations from the *Vindicator*, marked as such, are his identical words ; that I have not, and shall not garble or distort any

sentence, so as to misrepresent his meaning. Indeed, if I were so wickedly inclined, there is no temptation to it; for there is more *answerable* matter than I shall be able to get through for a long time, without distorting or affecting to misunderstand his words.

He tells me that I ought to have searched into the principles of their religion from the writings and instructions given by their own pastors and doctors, rather than from the disfigurations of their enemies. I have done the very thing that he requires of me; and he knows that I have done it; but it is the practice of all Popish writers to represent their adversaries as acting a contrary part, and thus they attempt to do away the impression which writings hostile to their system are likely to make. My practice has been, when entering upon the discussion of any Popish dogma, first to lay down the doctrine in the very words of their own great and approved authors; and in the most important points, I have not rested satisfied with the words of individuals, however great, but have had recourse to public documents, approved catechisms, and even to the authentic canons of the Council of Trent; and I have not yet been convicted of misquoting or misrepresenting a single word. The Vindicator's call upon me, therefore, to have recourse to doctors of his own church, is a piece of disingenuous finesse, to make his readers believe that I know nothing of the system, but have taken a representation of it from its enemies.

The Vindicator affects to find, from the admissions of Luther and Calvin, that Popery is more favourable to good morals than the new religion. "Thus," says he, "writes Luther:—'Men are now more revengeful, covetous, and licentious, than they were ever in the Papacy.'—*Postil. Super. Evang. Dom. I. adv.* Again, 'Heretofore, when we were seduced by the Pope, every man willingly performed good works, but now no man says or knows any thing else, but how to get all to himself by exactions, pillage, theft, lying, usury, &c.' *Postil. Super. Evang. Dom. 26. Post. Trin.* Calvin complained in the same strain of the effects of the new system. 'Of the many thousands,' said he, 'who renouncing Popery, seemed eagerly to embrace the gospel, how few have mended their lives! Nay, what else did the greater part pretend to, but by shaking off the yoke of superstition, to give themselves liberty to follow all kinds of licentiousness.' *Lib. de Scandalis.* Such was the state of morals among the new evangelized people under the influence of Protestantism, as testified by its originators; and is it improved at the present period?"—Then follows a long account of the profligacy of manners in England in the present day, as proved by the reports in the house of Commons, and the records of the Old Bailey, all which



is, of course, laid to the account of Protestantism. And we are invited to cast our eyes upon "Catholic" Ireland, and challenged to find if we can, the same rapid progress of depravity and crime in that island.

To the last part of the above I shall reply first; and I admit that we have not of late had to remark, in Ireland, such "*rapid progress* in depravity," as in England, and even in our own city; because Ireland, I mean the Popish part of it, was so proficient in depravity long ago, that she had not the same room for "*rapid progress*;" and it is well known that her depravity was the offspring of her Popery. Besides, rapid as our progress towards depravity has been of late years, the most depraved spot of great Britain, is unspeakably less depraved than the average of the more Popish parts of Ireland. This is a mere matter of fact, for the truth of which I appeal to all who are acquainted with the state of both countries; and I await their verdict without any apprehension of being cast.

Besides, the progress of depravity in Britain, particularly in Glasgow, has been greatly accelerated by the influx of Irish Papists. This is another matter of fact, for which I appeal to our justiciary records, and to the personal knowledge of every public functionary in this city and neighbourhood. No writer but one who is in the habit of distrusting his own senses, or who writes for those who do, would have ventured a comparison between Britain and Ireland, with regard to their moral condition, with a view to prove the superiority on the side of the latter; but this Mr. Andrews has done; from which the reader may draw his own conclusion with regard to his moral or intellectual condition.

Whether the words given as quotations from Luther and Calvin be genuine or not, I cannot tell. I have much reason to suspect a writer who publicly maintains that it is "perfectly correct and honourable" to give a half sentence as a whole one, and to suppress such words as explain an author's meaning. (See Number 150. p. 362.) It would not be difficult to ascertain the fact; but it does not appear to be worth while. Luther and Calvin may have used the words here ascribed to them, without the least disparagement of the doctrines of the Reformation; and they may have used such language, not because the state of morals was really worse, but because they had acquired a more acute discernment of moral turpitude; as old, and especially religious old men, have always been disposed to think the present age worse than the last.

It may be admitted, that when men shake off the yoke and the restraints of superstition, without coming under the influence of the gospel, they may exhibit more flagrant wickedness in their

conduct than before. Calvin speaks of some who *seemed* eagerly to embrace the gospel, but who did not amend their lives, or that but few of them did so. There were some, it would appear, who had reformed; from which the inference is, that these had really embraced the gospel, and the others only *seemed* to do so: nay it appears they avowed their infidelity; they pretended nothing else by shaking off the yoke of superstition, than to give themselves more liberty to follow all kinds of licentiousness. The Reformation is not to blame for the conduct of infidels and hypocrites, who never received its doctrines, or submitted to its discipline.

There is, however, one expression in the words ascribed to Luther, which leads me strongly to suspect that they are not his:—"when we were seduced by the Pope, *every man willingly performed good works.*" Luther's best friends admit that he was often unguarded in his language; but if ever he said any thing like this, it must have been in his sleep; for he knew, and all the world knows, that it was the wicked works which were the effect of Popish seduction in the form of indulgences which first opened his eyes to see the abominable character of Popery, and led him to throw off the yoke of Rome.

The Vindicator (col. 61.) makes a general reference to some documents and facts which I had adduced to prove the bloody cruelty of Popery; and the following is his reply:—"This system has existed for eighteen centuries; it exists now in full vigour in several populous and independent states on the continent; not all the cruel vengeance of Protestantism and Puritanism could subdue its influence in Ireland, where it has reigned fourteen hundred years; and does he (The Protestant) think that his imaginary cases are sufficient to establish his charge? No, no; he must explain to the reader the *extraordinary* methods used by Popery to make men *love* what is *hateful* to them. Few of us are fond of being tortured, and starved, and murdered, as The Protestant says the deluded victims of Popery *are* by its agents; and yet hundreds of Papists have suffered death under Protestant hands for adhering to it, while hundreds of others have fled to Popish countries from this Protestant kingdom, to avoid the same fate; and thousands and tens of thousands have borne every degree of insult and privation rather than renounce its influence. Now is not this something contrary to human nature and the usual course of things? Mankind in general love justice better than oppression; but according to the Protestant's logic, Catholics or Papists love cruelty and injustice better than mildness and equity. Protestants have had the *exclusive* care of the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of this kingdom for nearly two centuries, and the complaints from all parts of the island at this moment of the oppression of the

taxes are so loud, and the burden so universally felt, that numbers are daily leaving their country to seek for relief in a foreign land; the same as Catholics were *compelled* to do under the penal laws; and publications are hourly issuing from the press, calling on those who are left behind to seek a remedy for their grievances. This is the natural consequence of discontent. But, notwithstanding Popery is described to be of so abominable a nature in its design and tendency, that it not only *destroys our bodies by thousands and tens of thousands*, but sends our poor souls to *everlasting perdition by millions*, it still preserves its influence over the minds of men of all nations, nor could the gibbets and knives of our Protestant ancestors root it out of this and the sister island; nor will the absurd nonsense of THE PROTESTANT and his associates in folly and falsehood, impede the progress it is making in the number of its members. The sequel then must come to this: either the greatest bulk of Christians are the most stupid and senseless of mankind, or THE PROTESTANT is an arrogant and barefaced calumniator."

Such is the Vindicator's *full and particular* reply to the plain facts by which I proved Popery to be a system of cruelty. The reader will perceive that there is not so much as an attempt to disprove any one of these facts. The sum and substance of the reply is,—if Popery be as I described it, Papists are great fools, as well as "murderers and cut-throats," and I shall not controvert this inference any more than the other, for there are simple ones who love simplicity, and scorers who delight in their scorning, and fools who hate knowledge. It is perhaps difficult to account for the taste of such persons; but it is a fact, that both heathens and Papists do torture themselves and one another, sometimes to death, with a view, as they think, to satisfy divine justice; and they prefer this to the merciful plan of salvation revealed by the gospel. While this remains an undisputed fact, all the Vindicator's flourishes about men not loving what is hateful go for nothing.

If we were to believe the Vindicator, we would suppose that by some unaccountable charm, the whole matter of history had been reversed;—that it was Protestants who kindled the flames on Smithfield to burn Papists;—that it was Protestants, in Ireland, who at different times rose in arms, and murdered their Popish neighbours by thousands. Yes, he would not hesitate to assert this in plain words, to serve a purpose. No doubt his Popish readers believe it is so; and therefore it is that they regard Protestants with such murderous hatred—"nursing their wrath to keep it warm."



THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CLIV.

---

SATURDAY, JUNE 23d, 1821.

---

IN his fifth Number, the Vindicator adverts to Mr. Bourke's pamphlet, of which I gave an account in my first volume, No. XXIII. He does not know what to make of this production, which exposes in so strong a light the wicked practices of Irish Popish priests. He says "whether he was the publisher, or even the author of some of the sentiments imputed to him, is matter of doubt, as the work is printed for W. Whittemore, 56, Paternoster Row, London." I do not know any thing that he can allege against Mr. Whittemore, but that he is a Protestant, from which we are to infer, that no work published by a Protestant, though written by a Papist, can contain the truth. The editor, it seems, took upon him to abridge Mr. Bourke's *observations*, from which Mr. Andrews infers that we can have no dependence upon his *facts*; which is a species of logic much of a piece with what follows:—

"But what will the reader think when I inform him, that the accuser-general (i. e. The Protestant) and the reverend Romish priest, whom he has brought forward to sustain his charge, are at variance with each other in their assertions? The Protestant avers, that the system of Popery is a system of error and delusion, of cruelty and oppression. Mr. Bourke declares, in the preface to his work, from whence the former has so copiously quoted, and in his first letter therein to his prelate, that the Catholic or Popish religion, meaning of course the system, is HOLY, which word being defined by Dr. Johnson to signify *good, pure, sacred*, must be opposed to *falsehood and deceit*." col. 71. Thus, because Mr. Bourke has a better opinion of the Church of Rome than I have,

he is not to be believed in a statement of facts, which not only came within his own knowledge, but which really regarded himself. This must be the Vindicator's meaning, else it will be difficult to find any meaning in his words ; for I cannot suppose he seriously means to affirm that two persons, differing in opinion about the merits of a system, must necessarily contradict one another in a matter of fact. It is one of the inconsistencies of Mr. Bourke, that he continued to adhere to a church in which such horrible oppression was practised ; and that he still considered it a holy, and the true church ; but this, so far from making his testimony doubtful, ought rather to confirm it, because it is not probable that so steady a son would belie his holy mother.

The Vindicator (col. 72) makes the following strange concession : " That corrupt practices are committed by some of the clergy of the Catholic church, no one will deny ; it is the natural consequence of human frailty." I call this a strange concession, because it comes from one who boasts of the " spotless purity" of the Catholic priests in Ireland, and it is of these that he is speaking, when he admits that corrupt practices are committed by some of them. Now it is impossible that a church can be pure, if corrupt practices are known to exist among either priests or people, without instantly applying the divinely appointed means for the reformation, or expulsion of the corrupt members. Popish writers, and Mr. Andrews in particular, think they have sufficient ground for condemning the Reformation, when they have it admitted, that the Reformers may have erred, even in a speculative opinion. Now there is no error greater than " corrupt practice," of which some of the Irish priests are admitted to be guilty ; and this guilt must attach to the whole body, seeing they hold communion with such corrupt members, and allow them to exercise every priestly function. The lowest priest is greater in the Church of Rome than Luther and Calvin were in the Reformed Churches ; for he professes to be a successor of the apostles, and an infallible word-of-mouth teacher of the faith, which no Protestant believes the Reformers to have been. When, therefore, such priests err grievously in their practice, the Church of Rome is condemned, according to the reasoning of her own advocates. When such a circumstance as that which is here admitted of Romish priests, is known to exist in a Protestant church, her really sound members acknowledge and deplore her imperfection, and do what they can to remove it ; but in a perfect and infallible church, without spot or wrinkle, as Mr. Andrews affirms the Church of Rome to be, no such acknowledgment can consistently be made ; and to admit that some of her clergy are guilty of corrupt practices, is at once to overthrow the whole fabric of the church's holiness and infallibility.

In quoting Mr. Bourke, I gave sometimes his own words, and sometimes their substance in an abridged form. This was done professedly, and without marks of quotation, when I did not insert his own words. The Vindicator finds one paragraph thus abridged, which he quotes, col. 76, and which *he* thinks ought to have been given entire ; and, because it is not so given, he exclaims, "What a pitiful ! what a mean ! what a disgraceful trick is this, to impose upon the credulous and unthinking !" The thing is of little importance in itself, and not worth occupying the space which it would require to quote and reply to the accusation at length. But if any of my readers who took in the Vindicator, have preserved the 5th Number, I request they will turn to the passage, and see if there be any thing like trick or imposition in it ? whether I did not give the substance of the paragraph, without omitting a single article ? and whether Popery would have gained, or Protestantism lost any thing, by inserting it at length ?

This brings me to a more serious charge against the Vindicator himself than that of concealing the truth. It is the assertion of a downright falsehood. In Number 5, col. 80, he thus writes :— "By the terms of the solemn League and Covenant of the Kirk of Scotland, the Covenanters undertook to *extirpate all Papists by force of arms.*" I question if ever the Church of Rome produced a more impudent forgery. The words of that solemn document are : "II. That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of Popery, prelacy, (of which a description is given in a long parenthesis,) superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine, and the power of godliness ; lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues ; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one, in the three kingdoms." There is not a word about arms, or force of arms, in the whole deed ; and the above is all that it contains about extirpation. What a face of brass, therefore, must that man have, who can write such a falsehood !

Again, the Covenanters did not engage to extirpate *Papists*, as the Vindicator falsely asserts ; it was *Popery* that was the object of their hostility ; as it ought to be of every honest man. These things are as different and distinguishable as a man and his errors ; and the word *extirpate*, when applied to principles, not only does not imply force of arms, but cannot imply such a thing. According to Dr. Johnson, it signifies, to root out, to eradicate, to excise. Who ever heard of cutting off, or killing thoughts by a sword, or any other material weapon ? To extirpate, in reference to error, is no more than to supplant false principles by true ones, by means of reason and argument. An eloquent advocate of the "Catholic Claims," in the late Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, said, he desired



with all his heart to *extirpate Popery* ; but no man will suspect him of the least hostility towards the persons of Papists ; nay, he distinctly declared his conviction, that to put them upon a footing of political equality with Protestants, would have the effect of winning them from their errors ; which is the same thing as to extirpate Popery. I cannot agree with my reverend friend in the consequence which he anticipated ; but I refer to this part of his speech as affording an excellent illustration of the distinction between persons and their principles. In short, he is the best friend of the human race, who endeavours to extirpate false principles of every kind ; and every real friend of Papists must desire to extirpate Popery.

The Vindicator then draws a horrible picture of the sufferings of Papists, under the penal statutes ; and as this immediately follows his false assertion, that the Covenanters undertook to extirpate all Papists by force of arms, he means to insinuate, that this persecution was the practical effect of the solemn league ; though he has not so much as attempted to show that there was any connection between this, and the sufferings of his favourites, the Jesuits. That much individual suffering was the consequence of the penal statutes against Papists, I do not deny ; but they have their own church to thank for it, for the murderous principles which she inculcated, her no less murderous practices, and the turbulent, incessant plotting of her members, which rendered restrictions upon them a necessary measure of self-defence.

These statutes have been repealed long ago ; but instead of expressing gratitude for their removal, such writers as Mr. Andrews delight in keeping alive the memory of them, that they may perpetuate the hostility of their brethren against Protestants. In this country, Papists suffer no molestation whatever on account of their religion. This is in consequence of more enlightened ideas of liberty of conscience, which began to prevail about the middle of the last century. But the Church of Rome has not yet received one ray of light on this subject. It is scarcely a month since it was declared by the authorities in Portugal, to be unlawful to write any book against the established religion, which induced the editor of the Glasgow Courier to warn the Protestant to beware of venturing his person in that land of liberty. Hundreds of Jesuits are suffered, in this kingdom, to preach and write as much as they please against the established religion ; and the law of the land will suffer no weapon heavier than a quill to be raised against them ; and it is very certain that, if they had the administration of the law, they would soon “extirpate” The Protestant. They have been labouring for three years to extirpate his good name ; and, not many weeks ago, the Jesuits in Preston declared to the Mayor of that town, that he was a stirrer up of sedition ; that in short,

the publication of the Protestant was the cause of the late riots in Glasgow, meaning, I suppose, the radical rebellion ; and that, if he did not interfere to put down the Protestant Lectures preached occasionally in that town, the peace of the country would be disturbed. See the Protestant Advocate, attached to the Antijacobin Review for May. The editor adds, that the Mayor, much to his honour, refused to interfere. The application, however, was a direct attempt to suppress free discussion, and to commence a system of persecution with the influence which they have already acquired. Such freedoms have been used with my name in that quarter, that one of the preachers found it his duty to bear testimony, from the pulpit, in favour of my character. (See an excellent Sermon on Purgatory, by the Rev. Thomas Raffles, of Liverpool.) Thus, while incessantly complaining of being a persecuted people, all the persecution is practised by themselves ; and, were it not for the restraints of law, they would soon carry it much farther than the scourge of the tongue.

In his sixth Number, the Vindicator represents the gunpowder plot as a mere invention of Protestants to bring odium upon the Papists, for which I do not know that he has any higher authority than his great oracle and patron, Dr. Milner. It would not require greater impudence to assert that the Pope invented the *fable* of King Henry's divorce. The plot is a matter of history to which every reader has access ; and I should think it an insult to the understanding of my readers, to waste a minute in proving that it was a real conspiracy, planned by Papists, to murder the king and parliament, and overturn the Protestant establishment, in church and state, at a blow. History is nothing in the hands of such writers as Andrews. They have only to assert a thing was, or was not ; and the dupes of a bigoted superstition take their word as enough.

In this Number, we have another important admission by the Vindicator. It is a matter of history too, but so recent, that even his assurance will not enable him to deny it. I had been remarking, that it was the manner of Popish bishops to approve of any thing, however repugnant, that served their purpose. "We know," said I, "that the Pope approved the usurpation of Bonaparte, so far as to crown him and bless him as his dear son in the faith, because he could not help it. Neither can he help his adherents in Britain, or procure for them the privileges which they desire, without their taking the oath of allegiance, which the law requires ; he therefore approves of their taking it. But as he has never, by any public act that I know of, renounced his right to dispense with the oaths of his adherents, we have no security that he will not do what was often done by his predecessors, whenever he shall think proper ; especially when he finds that it will promote

the interest of the holy see." The Vindicator makes no attempt to refute what I here assert about the Pope's dispensing power ; but replies as follows :—

"Reader, candid and unprejudiced reader, canst thou restrain the feelings of just indignation at this base and malevolent insinuation against the fidelity and loyalty of the Catholic prelates and people of this kingdom, and against the character of a pontiff, whose unbending integrity and heroic firmness have gained him the praise of every friend and admirer of virtue and probity. *What if the Pope did crown Bounaparte*, he did not by that act confer one atom of power to him more than he already possessed ? It was merely the performance of a religious ceremony, the splendour of which was heightened by the presence of the head of the church, but conveyed no greater authority or security to the crowned head, than if the act had been done by a prelate of his own creation. But the Pope complied with the desire of Bounaparte 'because he could not help it !' He certainly would have resisted the request, if he had thought it contrary to his situation, the same as he resisted the command of the despot to declare war against this country, and lost both his territory and personal liberty, rather than violate the dictates of his conscience." Alas, for the conscience of a Pope that will not allow him to declare war against a people whom he excommunicates every year, on holy Thursday ! and against a sovereign, whose predecessors were, by his predecessors, dethroned and denounced by successive bulls, not one of which has been recalled or reversed. There is reason to suspect that it was something more imperative than the dictates of his conscience, that prevented him from declaring war against Great Britain, seeing it must have been a very elastic conscience indeed, that could stretch so far as to prostitute what every Papist must regard as a solemn religious rite, at the will of a usurper, and to consecrate his usurpation : though he "certainly could have resisted the request, if he thought it contrary to his situation." I admit that he certainly could have resisted it ; for it is not in the power of men, or devils either, to compel a man to do wrong, or to violate his conscience. When I said the Pope did so because he could not help it, I used the words hypothetically ; that is, if he wished to preserve his life, or his dignity, he could not resist the usurper's command ; but he might have resigned both dignity and life, and preserved his integrity, if he had had any.

The Vindicator's apology for his holiness is like that of the boy, who, finding his companions bent on robbing an orchard, and would not be persuaded to desist, thought he might as well go with them, and give them his countenance. They were already numerous enough to carry off every apple ; there would not be a whit more mischief done by his going, or less by his staying away.



So Pius VII. lent the sanction of his high, and pretended divine authority, to the usurpation of one of the most ruthless tyrants that ever afflicted the world, because, in doing so, he did not add one atom of power to him more than he already possessed. But did not the Pope know that the design of the thing was, and that the effect would be, to confirm the power which the tyrant had acquired, in the minds of all who attached any importance to the splendid religious ceremony of crowning and anointing in the name of the Lord? Thus he actually made himself, by his silly compliance, a party; or to use language fit for such a transaction, art and part guilty with the murderer and the plunderer of Europe.

As I have said, the Vindicator does not reply to what I had written about the Pope's dispensing power. He does not deny that he possesses this prerogative; he seems even to admit and justify it, in a long defence of the bull, by which the Pope granted to the kings and queens of France, and their successors for ever, the privilege of breaking such vows as "they cannot profitably keep;" or of exchanging them for something else that may be agreeable and profitable to them. The Vindicator has a long and laboured article in defence of this bull, which he rests chiefly on the assertion, that it was vows about religion that the Pope had in view, as if these were less binding than oaths between man and man; and because the favoured pair were to enjoy their privilege under the control of their confessor, which I did not conceal or deny: but when they were allowed to choose for confessor, any creature who was in priest's orders, they could easily find one whose conscience would be as accommodating as the Pope's in the case of Buonaparte. I consider any farther notice of this article unnecessary. Any man who regards truth and integrity, will find, in the Vindicator's own words, a sufficient refutation of his Jesuitical sophistry.

But, as usual, he has a great many *ifs*:—*if* the Pope has such power, how do such and such things take place? and by putting a question in this way, hundreds of times, he leaves the object of his attack, or proposed refutation, just as he found it. Thus:—"If the Pope possesses this right of dispensing with our oaths, what occasion had he to approve that of 1791? Could he not have procured for us all the privileges we desire, by dispensing with our taking (i. e. permitting us to take) the oath of supremacy and abjuration, and the declaration against transubstantiation?" No doubt he could do this, and perhaps he would, were it compatible with the security of his children, and retaining them in filial subjection. But no man can take the oath of abjuration, without renouncing both the Pope's temporal and spiritual authority; and though most of our British Papists profess to renounce the temporal, they cannot renounce the spiritual, without renouncing

the Pope altogether, and ceasing to be Papists. There may be some who do so, and continue Papists at heart ; but they must not profess themselves such, else they would instantly be marked as perjured persons ; and the same thing would attach to any priest, who should receive consecration, or any spiritual faculty, from his holiness. In short, if the oath of abjuration were universally taken, the Church of Rome would have no visible existence in this kingdom ; and we are not to suppose the Pope will permit that to be done, which would subvert his own spiritual dominion.

There are some Papists who would not scruple to take the oath of supremacy, if they were allowed to attach their own meaning to the words. I showed, in a late Number, that one of Mr. Andrews' correspondents, in the *Orthodox Journal*, argued the lawfulness of swearing that the king is the head of the Church of England : but he would not swear that he was the head of the church *in* England ; for, in his opinion, the head of *the church* every where is the Pope. There is a very strong reason why the Pope should not permit his subjects to make the declaration against transubstantiation, and why they should not make it though he were to permit them : for suppose a man to declare upon oath to-day, that he does not believe that the bread and wine in the eucharist are changed into the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ ; and suppose him to appear at the altar to-morrow, and worship the bread and wine, and hold them up to be worshipped with divine honour, he would be under the necessity of making his choice. whether the world should set him down for a perjured person or an idolater ; for it would be impossible to clear himself of both ; and no man, in his right senses, would choose to acknowledge himself guilty of either.

I request the reader's serious attention to these hints ; for the argument which I am combating has much higher authority than that of Mr. Andrews ; it has been used by members of both houses of parliament, who gravely maintain, that Papists must be very honest men, and may safely be admitted into places of power and trust, seeing they will not swear the oaths to which they have conscientious objections, though, by the swearing of them, they would become eligible to all places and honours. But there is no merit in refusing to do that by which one would instantly become felon ; or would instantly make himself infamous ; for no Papist can take the oath of supremacy, without ceasing to be a Papist ; and no believer in transubstantiation can swear that he does not believe it, without convicting himself of perjury.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CLV.

---

SATURDAY, JUNE 30th, 1821.

---

THE last four Numbers of *The Protestant* were occupied by replies to the principal topics in the first six Numbers of the *Catholic Vindicator*. I have passed over a number of little personal matters, which are not worth the answering, because any reader who understands the subject may answer them for himself; and because I am very little concerned about the *Vindicator's* assertions with regard to my character and motives, seeing I have convicted him of gross falsehood, as the reader will see, in my last Number. I am as little concerned about the opinion he has formed and expressed with regard to my principles, seeing he maintains the principle, that Christianity owes its rise to the influence of Popery, as I have shown from his own words, in the Number before last. If there be such things as works of supererogation, certainly it must be a work of this kind, to make a serious reply to the writings of such a man, because they carry their own refutation in the very face of them. His favourite, and often repeated reply to those parts of my work which convict Papists of impiety and absurdity, is, *If* this were so, then Papists are the most besotted and stupid creatures in the world; and I must say, it is even so, if they continue to adhere to him as their champion and oracle.

I am now come to a part of his work in which there is something like system, in which, at least, he keeps a long while by a subject; that is, the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, which I accused his church of holding. To this subject he seems to have applied his whole strength; and I strongly suspect that he



had the aid of abler pens than his own. After a great many proofs from Romish writers of great eminence, who all certified that the above was a commonly received doctrine of the church in their day, I agreed to rest the whole weight of the cause on one single point, namely, the declaration of the Council of Constance. I repeat it here, for the sake of connection, and to save the trouble of reference:—

“ The holy Synod of Constance declares, concerning every safe conduct granted by the emperor, kings, and other temporal princes, *to heretics*, or persons *accused of heresy*, in hopes of reclaiming them, that it ought not to be of any prejudice to the catholic faith, or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor to hinder but that such persons may and ought to be examined, judged, and punished, according as justice shall require, if those heretics shall refuse to revoke their errors, although they shall have come to the place of judgment relying on their safe conduct, and without which they would not have come thither; and the persons who have promised them security, *shall not, in this case, be obliged to keep his promise, by whatsoever tie he may have been engaged*, when he has done all that is in his power to do.”

The design of this canon was evidently to establish a speciality in the rule with regard to heretics, which did not apply to other persons, such as prisoners of war, or even robbers, and other such malefactors, for it does not appear ever to have been counted lawful to break faith with them, in any circumstances. But, with heretics no promise was to be kept, if it should in any wise prejudice the catholic faith and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The canon farther proceeds upon a principle held indisputable by the Council, that heretics were to be examined, judged, and *punished*, if they refused to revoke their heresy; that is, some *opinion* which they held, not quite consistent with the faith of Rome; and, if convicted of holding any such opinion, however blameless in their lives, the emperor, or any magistrate, who had advised them to come to the Council, with a passport, and solemn oath, that he would see them conveyed safely home again, was relieved from this solemn obligation, provided his protegee was convicted of heresy, and he had done all that he could for him. In short, the canon clearly establishes,—first, that persons holding any opinion different from the established faith of Rome, are to be punished as heretics, which is, to be burnt to death, as the fact proved in the case of Huss, for which it was framed; and, secondly, that persons convicted of heresy, and who, conscious of their innocence as to any crime, came to a tribunal to which they were summoned to answer for something laid to their charge, under a solemn pledge that no ill should befall them, and who would not have come without such pledge, are yet, by a solemn declaration of the

Council, deprived of the benefit of the promise and oath of the magistrate, on which they had depended for their personal safety. This, I say, was a special rule made for heretics alone; for nothing of the kind appears ever to have been decreed against thieves or murderers.

Now The Catholic Vindicator, the accredited organ of our Glasgow Papists, approves and defends the above canon in every iota of it; and yet he is incessantly calling for liberty of conscience, and abusing our government for withholding it. Here, to prevent the least suspicion of doing him injustice, I shall give his own words:—"Here then we have the doctrine of the Council of Constance, as given by THE PROTESTANT; and by what perversion of language can he make out that *this* decree *established* the tenet, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, and that, as it has *never been repealed*, it *remains* as much a law of the church as communion without the cup? What is there odious in the words of this decree? What that can be offensive to the most fastidious Protestant? The synod declares that every *safe conduct* granted, ought not to prejudice the catholic faith, or church authority, nor hinder the individual holding the passport from being examined, judged, and punished, as JUSTICE shall require. And what *injustice* can be in this? The particular object in question was John Huss, who was then a professed member of the Catholic Church, but disagreeing with the church on some fundamental principles of doctrine, she assembled her judges to decide on his opinions, and call upon him to correct his error, if found to be such, on pain of being put out of her communion. Now *this right* THE PROTESTANT has declared exists in every society, by virtue of the writings of St. Paul, and surely he will not deny it to the Church of Rome, nor blame the fathers of the Council of Constance for asserting such right, which is all that they did in the first part of the decree. And what is the *correct* inference to be drawn from the concluding part of it? Why nothing farther than that the civil magistrate, if he has engaged to perform *more* than he has *authority* to do, is not obliged to keep his promise, provided he has done all that he can do, to fulfil those conditions of it, *which he can and ought to perform*. This is the *true* construction of this famous decree which The Protestant has produced, to convict the Church of Rome of teaching antichristian doctrine, inimical to the happiness of society, and the divines of six of her universities of falsehood, in denying the fact! Turn and twist the meaning as he pleases, the writer cannot make more of it than that it was confined to a specified local object, and by no means intended to (be) a general rule. It related *solely* to the construction and power of *free passports*, from the lawful and just obligations of which none could be released, according to the

decree itself, until 'he had done all that was in his power to do,' to fulfil them ; there is no mention or allusion whatever, directly or indirectly, to any other promises or contracts, and therefore they could not be comprehended in it." col. 121, 122.

Here the decree in question is defended in every point, from which it is clear, the Vindicator thinks it just and lawful to examine, judge, and *punish* men for difference of opinion. He quotes my own doctrine, that, according to Paul's writings, every church has a right to put out of her communion, those who disagree with her in fundamental points ; and he would have his readers believe this was all that was done to Huss by the Council of Constance. But there is a trifling circumstance which he did not think proper to mention in this connexion :—had Huss been tried by such a church as The Protestant was speaking of, and put out of her communion, he would have been allowed to go home without molestation, under the safe conduct which he had received from the emperor ; whereas, the Council of Constance delivered him up to be burnt to death ; and persuaded the emperor that, seeing he was a heretic, he was not bound to keep faith with him.

The Vindicator would have us believe that the emperor Segismund had promised more than he had authority to perform, and therefore his promise was not binding. Now what the emperor did was this :—he required one of his own subjects, living in Bohemia, to appear at the Council of Constance, and answer to some accusations preferred against him, in relation to certain points of doctrine which he was alleged to have preached, not quite accordant with the reigning standard of orthodoxy. Huss, knowing the temper of the Council, was afraid that some mischief would befall him. In order to remove his apprehension, the emperor gave him, in writing, what was called a *safe conduct*, or passport for going to the Council, sojourning at Constance, and safe return home. After the Council had condemned Huss, and delivered him over to the secular power to be burnt, the emperor actually pleaded his solemn promise of security to the Bohemian ; but the Council told him in effect, that he had now no business with him, but to see that he was burnt to death. He had done all he *could do* ; he had no power to interfere with regard to any sentence of the church. This is the fair construction, which, according to Mr. Andrews, is to be put upon that nefarious transaction ; by which it appears that sovereign princes were the bond slaves of a band of insolent priests ; and that even an emperor had not power to keep his promise, by protecting one of his own subjects from priestly rage, though that subject had put himself within their power, relying upon the promise of his sovereign, that he should be conducted home in safety. The emperor would have acted like a sovereign prince, if, instead of yielding to their sophistry, and



gratifying their malice, by murdering an innocent man, he had surrounded the Council by an armed force, broken up their sitting, and sent every one of them about his business. This is what he *had power* to do, and what he would have done, had he been a man of spirit, and a man of his word.

The law of the holy church about not keeping faith with heretics was thus explicitly declared. I challenged the Church of Rome to show when it was repealed, or condemned by equal authority, and promised that, if any person could show this, I would give up the point, and allow that the Church of Rome was better now than she was of old. Mr. Andrews, absurdly enough, calls this a challenge to prove a negative; but it is no such thing; the repeal, or authoritative condemnation of a law, is as positive a thing as the enactment of it. He undertakes, however, to prove that the doctrine in question was condemned by the Council of Constance itself; and the following is the manner in which he does it:—

“ Although, as the theologues of Alcala say, there was nothing *defined* concerning breach of faith by the Council of Constance, yet the fathers of that assembly, by the following decree, passed by them in the very session alluded to by THE PROTESTANT, most clearly condemned the very doctrine which they have been accused of establishing and maintaining:—‘ This most holy synod, being solicitous, as it is in duty bound, (having been assembled for that especial purpose,) to provide for the extirpation of error and heresies in various parts of the world, has, of late, heard that certain propositions *erroneous* in faith, and adverse to good morals, highly scandalous, and tending to subvert the order of governments, have been publicly taught, and, amongst others, this especial one has been reported to it:—

“ ‘ Any tyrant, as he may licitly and meritoriously, so he ought to be slain by his subjects or vassals, without awaiting the sentence or order of any judicial authority, though his death be effected by secret fraud, insidious flattery, and blandishments, and *be in violation of a pledged oath or engagement entered into with him.*

“ ‘ This holy synod, anxious to oppose itself to this error, and effectually to eradicate the same, after having maturely considered it, decrees, determines, and declares, this doctrine to be erroneous in faith and in morals: and reprobates and condemns it as heretical, scandalous, and leading to frauds, deceit, lies, and treachery. It moreover determines, decrees, and declares, that all persons pertinaciously holding this most dangerous opinion, are heretics, and ought to be punished as such, according to canonical regulations.’ *Concil. Studio Labbei. tom. xii. p. 143. Edit. Par. 1672.*

“ Surely,” says Mr. Andrews, “ this declaration is sufficient to convince even the sceptic, that this charge brought against the

Church of Rome, is totally groundless, and that it was invented for the basest of purposes." *col. 158, 159.* Now let the reader remember, that the Council of Constance is charged with having laid it down as a genuine principle, that it was lawful to break faith with *heretics*; and, in particular, that the emperor was not bound to keep faith with a *heretical* subject. This was the decision, or decree, call it what you will, concerning which I challenged the Church of Rome to show that it had ever been repealed or condemned by equal authority, promising that, if this were shown, I would give up the point. The Vindicator accepted the challenge; and he triumphantly produced the decree which I have just quoted, as sufficient to convince even the sceptic, that my accusation of the Council was unfounded. I acknowledge it to be a very good and wholesome decree. It declares it unlawful for *subjects* to assassinate their *princes*, though they be tyrants "*in violation of a pledged oath or engagement entered into with them.*" But this is very different from the question of a prince, a priest, or any other tyrant breaking faith with heretics, of which this decree says not a word: and, therefore, it cannot be a repeal or condemnation, of the other decree past in the same session, by which it was declared that the emperor, kings, and other temporal princes, who had given promises of safety to heretics, were not obliged to keep their promises, *by whatever tie they might be engaged.*

The above is all that the Vindicator had to adduce in answer to my challenge; and, as it relates to a very different subject, it must stand for no answer at all. The charge, therefore, is completely substantiated. It *was* decreed by the Council of Constance, that engagements with heretics were not binding; that is, that faith was not to be kept with them. The Vindicator, with the aid of his patron, Bishop Milner, and all the Jesuits in England, has not been able to produce a document that so much as implies a subsequent condemnation, or disavowal of this doctrine; but has attempted to divert the public mind from the point at issue, by citing a decree upon a quite different subject; from which it clearly follows, that my point is established; and what was declared by so great a Council, as the doctrine of the church, *was*, and *is*, and must be her doctrine, while she exists; for she is unchangeable and infallible. For a great deal of collateral evidence on this subject, I refer to my first volume; in which I showed, from great authors of their own, that the principle was undisputed, and was acted upon, without shame or scruple, for hundreds of years.

This point established, I decline having any thing to do with the various cases which the Vindicator adduces, to show that Protestants also have been guilty of breach of faith; such, for instance, as the Bank of England breaking faith with the public, when she suspended specie payments, which seems to occasion the Vindicator

great triumph, as a complete set off against the decree of the Council of Constance. The Bank of England is not a Christian church; and, though it were, I have no voice in it, and am not responsible for its doings, any more than for its notes. If this great national corporation had passed a law, declaring that they would pay no note that was presented by a Papist, for that no faith was to be kept with Papists, I grant that there would have been some analogy between that and the canon of Constance. but this was not the case; and I venture to assure Mr. Andrews, that if he will go to the Bank of England with one of her notes, he will receive payment in gold, without being asked whether he is a heretic or not.

I suppose I need not use many more words to show that my accusation of the Church of Rome, with regard to not keeping faith with heretics, is completely established, and that the Vindicator has failed in his attempt at rebutting it. I shall advert to only one article more on this subject, as affording a fair specimen of the Vindicator's mode of evading a question, and of arguing from one thing to another. He approves of all Bishop Lanigan's reasons for breaking promises, for which see his 12th and 13th Numbers. I had said, that Lanigan's elastic morality would allow me to refuse to accept the bill of a correspondent in Dublin, from whom I had ordered a lot of linen, and to whom I had given a promise of honouring his draft, if circumstances were so changed, that the price of linen had fallen in Glasgow, before that which I ordered had arrived. Every merchant knows that such refusal would be a breach of faith; but I showed that Dr. Lanigan's doctrine, supported by St. Thomas, would bear me out in breaking my promise, because "the circumstances are changed; and because I intended to fulfil my promise when I made it, I am guilty of no untruth, though I should now break it." To this the Vindicator replies:—"What a flimsy sophister! what a dull reasoner! but what a bold asserter! And could not THE PROTESTANT find an argument more in point than his lot of linen, and his correspondent's bill? St. Thomas, when giving his case, knew very little of commercial affairs, and did not contemplate, I will answer for it, the meaning which the accuser has given to it. However, supposing he did, Papists are not so ignorant as to be unacquainted with the civil laws of the country, which will enforce a compliance, should they be inclined to such swindling propensities. But they know that such a circumstance will not free them from the obligation, although there are other circumstances, which I am sure THE PROTESTANT would most readily avail himself of, were he under a promise of the kind. For example; suppose him to order a quantity of linen of a certain *quality*, and he promises to accept his correspondent's bill for the same; but, suppose his correspond-



ent to send him a lot *inferior* to the sample he ordered and expected, but at the same price, would he accept the bill according to promise? Or would he not demur because the circumstances are changed? Would he be guilty of an untruth, by *thus* breaking his promise, as he intended to fulfil it, had the contract been executed according to order? He will not answer me in the affirmative; and, if he did, no one, I am sure, would believe him. No, no; he would be glad to shelter himself under St. Thomas' case; and, if that did not protect him, he would apply to some lawyer, to enforce the doctrines of the theologians and canonists, read by the Rev. James Lanigan." col. 202, 203.

Let the reader remember, that St. Thomas' doctrine, applied and exemplified by bishop Lanigan, is, that a man is freed from the obligation of his promise on a *change of circumstances*; that is, any providential change that may happen, without blame being attachable to either party. But the Vindicator proceeds upon the supposition, that one party has not fulfilled the condition with which the promise was connected, and then he argues that in such a case, I would break my promise as well as any Papist. Here, however, the intelligent merchant will perceive that there is no promise to break. If I order fine linen, and promise to accept my correspondent's bill for the value of fine linen; and if he sends me *coarse* linen at the *price of fine*, and draws accordingly, I break no promise by refusing to accept his draft, for he has not obeyed the order to which my promise was annexed. He has committed a fraud, or indiscretion at least, for which he himself ought to be responsible. I am afraid that I shall be accused of trifling with my readers, by adverting to such an absurdity in the form of an argument; but I cannot adduce a fairer specimen of the manner in which Mr. Andrews endeavours to reply to THE PROTESTANT.

I conclude the present Number by informing the reader, that the long depending action between Mr. Scott and me was decided in the Jury Court, Edinburgh, on the morning of Tuesday last, after a trial of seventeen hours. Mr. Scott laid his damages at 3000*l.* for injury which he alleged to have sustained by some passages in my work; and the Jury awarded him 100*l.* for my share of the mischief, 20*l.* against Mr. Sym, of the town's Hospital, for his share in it, and 1*s.* against each of my printers, for their share. I have not time to give a more particular account of the trial in the present Number; but it shall occupy a large space in a future one.

THE

# Protestant,

No. CLVI.

---

SATURDAY, JULY 7th, 1821.

---

A FRIEND informs me that he lately overheard two Papists conversing on the subject of THE PROTESTANT, when the one said to the other, "That fellow is driving our religion all to *jaup*, but Mr. Scott will get the better of him at the law." There happens to be more truth in this, than we usually hear from the mouth of Papists. The reader is able to judge of the truth of the first part of it, when he sees the *jaupy* appearance that Popery makes when exhibited in her naked deformity; and for the truth of the second part of the observation, I have to inform him, that Mr. Scott has indeed got the better of me at the law. I mentioned this in a short notice at the end of my last Number; and as my readers at a distance, will not be able to comprehend how this should have happened, I shall proceed to inform them.

At the commencement of my work, I stated what was then the subject of general belief and conversation, that the Chapel in Clyde Street was built at the expense of a poor and starving people. In my Ninth Number, I related some anecdotes to confirm the fact; and Mr. Scott, considering himself aggrieved by what I had written, raised an action of damages against me about a year ago.\* His complaint included the letter of Mr. Sym, contained in my LXXII. Number, and this gentleman was comprehended in the action. When the cause came to be tried, I was allowed a proof of some of my statements, but not of others, because I could not condescend on dates of things which I had published three years ago, and which had happened a long time before that; and from some rule of court, quite new to my Counsel, and which I cannot

\* [The passages complained of by Mr. Scott have, as formerly stated, been left out in this edition: the author's remarks on the trial, however, in this No. and some succeeding ones, are retained.]

comprehend, I was not allowed to prove the truth of Mr. Sym's statement. Things of this nature, when brought to trial, whatever they be in fact, are considered false in law, if not positively proved by competent witnesses; which, as a general principle, I am by no means disposed to condemn. I was allowed to prove four issues, as they are called, three of which were declared by the chief commissioner of the court, in his address to the jury, to have had evidence adduced in their support, and the fourth not proved, inasmuch as that which was stated in the issue to have happened about six years ago, could not have taken place since the year 1813. The court were decidedly of opinion that certain words which I had used in reference to the manner, and the means by which Mr. Scott levied money from his poor people, were libellous; and the jury being of the same opinion to a certain extent, found a verdict for the pursuer, as mentioned in my last. The trial excited an uncommon degree of interest; and much eloquence was displayed by counsel on both sides. A report of it has been published in all the Newspapers, with which it is needless to occupy my pages; but I intend to publish, as soon as possible, in a separate form, a more detailed account, with several documents connected with it. I thought at one time of giving it at length in *THE PROTESTANT*, but as it could not be contained in one Number, the connexion would be so broken as not to afford a fair view of the case.

I am aware that the fact of Mr. Scott having "got the better of me at the law," will occasion great triumph among all the Papists in the three kingdoms. It will be considered as a complete set-off against all that I have written about Popish idolatry, error, and superstition. Much need they had of something of the nature of a triumph. They have picked out a few sentences in three large volumes of weekly papers, all written during the intervals of business, and amidst innumerable interruptions; and these sentences not being worded with that caution which a writer better acquainted with the law would have used, they have found me liable in damages, and exposed me to an enormous expense. This is all their triumph; but Popery remains as it was, unvindicated and undefended;—a bloated system of idolatry, superstition, and cruelty. As such I have been, for three years, holding it up to the scorn and derision of the world; as such I shall continue to expose it; and the trial which has taken place, with the verdict against me, will have this happy effect, that greater interest in the cause will be excited, and my work more extensively circulated.

The trial has given me one advantage which I did not formerly possess,—that of identifying Mr. Scott, in some measure, with the *Catholic Vindicator*. I was never before able to ascertain this, else it would perhaps have been a sufficient defence against



any claim of damages that he could make, because the language of the *Vindicator* is infinitely more abusive of me, than ever mine was of Mr. Scott. Aware of this, the pursuer was at great pains to make it appear that he had no hand in that work. His counsel in the strongest language disavowed, and, I think, even condemned it; and Bishop Cameron, the first witness examined on his side, deponed that he disapproved of both Andrews and his writings; that he believed no Catholic Clergyman in Scotland approved of them; and farther, that of the four Vicars Apostolic in England, they were approved by only one, namely, Dr. Milner. Mr. Scott had been at the pains to get a deposition from Mr. Andrews himself, which was read in court, in which he declared that he had been informed that at first Mr. Scott approved of the *Vindicator* as a work of controversy, but that towards the conclusion, he had discouraged it, and that he was not the writer of any part of it. But Mr. Henniker, another of his witnesses, deponed that Mr. Scott, one Sunday, after Christian doctrine, that is, after sermon in his chapel, actually exhorted his people to buy the work, in order to indemnify the committee who had become bound to Mr. Andrews for the expense of it, and who were suffering loss in consequence of its not selling. I am therefore entitled to consider him as an approver of the CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, and a party concerned in all the libellous matter which it contains; and had I known the fact in time to have taken an issue upon it, I am persuaded he would not have obtained a farthing of damages.

I shall here quote a few passages from the work which Mr. Scott recommended to his people, to show the freedoms which have been used with my name. I am afraid of disgusting the reader, but he is well off in being called upon to suffer nothing but disgust. It never came into my head to bring the calumniator into a court of law, to answer for his libellous productions, because I felt conscious that none of his calumnies applied to me; and that I was able to answer him by facts and arguments; and it is only those who are conscious that they have not this advantage that would take advantage of the law to silence an adversary:—

“If,” says Mr. Andrews, speaking of the Protestant, “if he thinks me an infidel and a heathen, I have *proved* him to be a *fabricator* and a *forger*; and before he again asserts that I worship the devil, I would recommend *him* seriously to break off *his* connexion with the father of lies. If he does not attend to my advice it will be the worse for him, and he will, before long, wish that he had been as incapable of writing, as his three credible witnesses; for then he would not have exposed himself, as he has now done; nor given the honest citizens of Glasgow the opportunity of

pointing their finger at him, and saying, there goes the calumniator of Catholicity, and lying advocate of Protestantism." col. 480.

In col. 511, I am called a "convicted fabricator and confuted liar." In 548, a rancorous bigot and "a cowardly assassin." In 557, an "unprincipled libeller." In 567, I am represented as "a convicted forger, and protector of an adulterous strumpet."\* This surely is bad enough, and had I said any thing like this of Mr. Scott, I deserved to pay heavy damages. The following is equally calumnious, but more artfully laid. The Vindicator, by a sort of side wind, endeavours to identify me with the first of the radicals, as if I were one of that noisy and turbulent fraternity. In col. 607 we read as follows:—

"How came The Protestant to forget the trials of Mr. Thomas Muir, before the supreme court of Justiciary at Edinburgh, and the Rev. Mr. Palmer, a dissenting minister of Dundee, before the circuit court of Justiciary, in the year 1793; the first of whom was sentenced to be transported fourteen years, and the latter seven? Has he forgotten the trial and execution of Mr. Robert Watt for high treason at Edinburgh, in the year following? What, however, I wish particularly to ask him is, if he does not recollect 'the British Convention' which assembled about this period; and whether he does not know a person then residing at Paisley, who became a member of this political assembly, and after possessing himself of its secrets and proceedings, went to the office

\* This refers to the woman whose husband left her because she would not become a Papist. Her character is without reproach in the neighbourhood in which she has long resided; yet Mr. Andrews never, or scarcely ever mentions her name, or refers to her, but in such language as the above. If she had the means of taking him and his committee to the law, there can be no doubt she would obtain damages suitable to their ability and her circumstances. By "protector," as applied to me, nothing more can be meant, consistently with truth, than that I have taken this woman's part against her enemies; but he knows that the word has a *fashionable* meaning, especially when connected with such words as he has made to follow it; and no doubt he wishes it to be applied to me in this fashionable sense; and if Popery shall exist next century, these words will be raked up out of the dust; and such writers as the Vindicator will boldly maintain that "THE PROTESTANT," who wrote against *Catholicity* in the nineteenth century, was literally such a man as these slanderous words indicate. Luther and other reformers, in this manner, are slandered by Papists at this day; and it does not appear that any cotemporary writer laid such a foundation for it as the Vindicator has here laid for the abuse of my name, if the remembrance of it shall survive myself. Here the malignant character of Popery appears in its true light. This is a species of persecution more cruel than that of the stake or the gibbet; and who can doubt that these will be put in requisition also whenever Papists obtain the power? I am not speaking of Papists in Spain or Italy, but of those who live in the midst of us, who hired and paid the Vindicator for writing such abominable calumnies, who gave them all the publicity in their power, and had the work containing them recommended on a Sunday in their chapel.

of the Sheriff court, and there basely betrayed his former associates, by which disgraceful proceeding some of them were transported beyond the seas for sedition, of whom a Mr. Margarot, I believe, for I write from memory, was one, and who returned from exile but two or three years since? I hope The Protestant will not refuse me a plain and unequivocal answer to these questions, nor delay satisfying me so long as he did in the case of the man in the Wynd."

This is evidently meant to insinuate that I was a member of the famous British Convention, held at Edinburgh in 1793, of which, and of its consequences, Mr. Andrews seems to know much more than I do, for certainly I was not then of age to be a member of so grave an assembly, though I do recollect something of it. He insinuates also, that I became an informer, and that I betrayed my associates, so that some of them were banished. In a subsequent part of his work, he proceeds upon the assumption of this being a fact, which he at first puts forth as a matter of enquiry, and he affects to be afraid lest I should inform against him at the Sheriff's Office, col. 657. I can scarcely call this libellous matter, because, upon the supposition that I had been a member of a political assembly, and that I had unexpectedly found them seditiously disposed, it would have been my duty to inform against them, and to put the magistrates upon their guard. In point of fact, however, no such event ever took place in my history. The thing was a mere fabrication of Mr. Andrews, or of his Glasgow committee; and the intention of it evidently was to mark me out as an object of vengeance to the radicals, who then considered themselves as lords of the ascendant, and about to become proprietors of the soil. From his Glasgow correspondents he would learn that I was extremely active in opposing the machinations of the radicals, and in exciting the citizens to take up arms for their defence; for which purpose I went from house to house through a whole ward of the city, and superintended the distribution of arms from the barracks. In order, therefore, to mark me out as an object of vengeance, he, or his correspondents, invented the above story; and had I raised an action of damages against him and them at that time, I have no doubt I should have been able to make some of them leave the country, or to continue in it against their will under lock and key. But it was never the persons or the property of Papists that I suffered to occupy my attention, but only their errors; of which it was indeed my wish to denude them, not for my advantage, but for their profit.

But I shall give a specimen or two more of the libellous manner in which the *Vindicator* writes; and let it not be forgotten, that this is the work which Mr. Scott recommended to his people, one Sunday, "after Christian doctrine;"—"I tell you, Mr. William M'Gavin, this will not do: you must come forward and clear



yourself from the many gross contradictions, and misrepresentations, and *falsehoods*, which I have proved against you, or the work which you have undertaken will only be considered, what it really is, a tissue of inconsistencies and untruths, penned by a *convicted fabricator, and retailer of lies.*" col. 672.

Towards the conclusion of his work, the Vindicator gives my name and surname in connexion with all that is vile and infamous; and not content with this, he, or his committee, had me posted upon the corners of the streets every week, in great hand bills, as a coward, a forger, a defender of adultery, &c. &c. all which I suffered without ever thinking it worth while to apply to a court of law, because I was sure that those who knew me did not believe that I was guilty of such things. I hoped to live down, and to write down all such calumnies. I have done so; and had I taken any other way to silence my adversaries, had I raised an action of damages against them, it would have laid the foundation of a reasonable suspicion that I really was what they represented me to be, that is, "a *deceiver* and a *cheat*, and as such, deserving the *execration* of all honest men." col. 674.

I am persuaded the reader is heartily tired of such coarse and scurrilous abuse, and I should have spared him the pain of reading it, had I not ascertained the fact that it was approved and paid for by a committee of Glasgow Papists, and actually recommended to them, "one Sunday, after Christian doctrine."

The Catholic Vindicator contains, amidst all its abuse, some curious disclosures, relating both to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome. It was my intention to have touched but slightly on these, and to have made the third volume the last of my work, extending it a few Numbers beyond the size of the first and second; but the flattering approbation which I continue to receive from all quarters, Rome always excepted, and the extraordinary degree of interest which I have been honoured to excite in behalf of the Protestant cause, which I consider the same as genuine Christianity, have determined me to persevere for a longer period, and to commence a fourth volume, of which the first Number will be published on Saturday next, the 14th instant, to be continued weekly as heretofore.

The question, *cui bono?* is not asked so frequently now, as it was when I began to write three years ago. The public mind is more alive to the subject than it was then. Events have risen in the course of providence which have drawn the minds of many to serious reflection, and to anticipate the possibility of danger to our civil and religious privileges, from the countenance that is given to Popery in different quarters. We hear not indeed of many conversions to Popery, at least among persons of education and respectable rank in society; but there is a very prevailing in-

difference to Bible Christianity among all ranks, which leads men to the verge of Popery before they are aware of it. Having the name of Christian, without the thing signified by it, persons are in a state the most favourable for embracing Popery, because it flatters them with the notion that they have the thing, if they are but observant of certain forms, which they can easily be, without any change of heart ; without giving up their love of sin, or even the practice of it ; without love to God or deadness to the world, or any of the features of that holiness, without which, it is declared no man shall see the Lord.

Add to this prevailing indifference to real Christianity, the extraordinary degree of favour into which Papists have wrought themselves with many of our senators, I may say a majority of them, in the lower house ; insomuch that a bill actually passed that house, which, had it passed into a law, would have brought Papists in among them, and into the upper house also, and into all places of power and trust, with one or two exceptions, which exceptions would not long have remained, had Papists themselves been brought in to legislate along with persons already prepared to go all lengths in concessions to the " Roman Catholics," as they are now almost universally denominated, and whose virtues are praised in such terms as if it were believed that virtue would die with them.

I have often said that the subject of " Catholic emancipation" did not belong to my plan, though I have at different times slightly touched upon it ; and I venture to affirm, that no person is capable of judging of the merits of that question, until he has studied the character of Popery as exhibited in the writings, and in the practice of Papists. I affirm this with the more confidence, seeing I know both sides of the question, and because a careful study of the system has overcome my own prepossessions, which, at the time I began to write, were all on the side of emancipation. Ever since I was capable of reflection, I have abhorred every species of persecution for conscience' sake, or for the sake of religion ; and I abhor it at this hour as much as ever I did ; but my mistake lay in considering that persecution which is not so. It is not persecution to prevent aliens from sitting in parliament, or in our courts of justice, because every state requires, for its own security, that those who legislate, or administer its laws, be in a condition to maintain undivided allegiance to the sovereign. This an alien cannot do, for he is under a previous obligation of allegiance to a foreign power, which may levy war against the state under which he enjoys protection. A Papist is precisely in this state. Let him declare allegiance to the crown of Great Britain and Ireland, in terms as strong as words can make them, they cannot set aside a previous allegiance which he owes to the Pope, in virtue of a grant which

he believes Jesus Christ to have given to him through the medium of St. Peter. This is an allegiance to which every other must of necessity give place. They say it is only spiritual allegiance, but it is impossible to render spiritual allegiance to a creature without being liable to render temporal allegiance also, whenever the spiritual power shall require it. To suppose the contrary, would be to suppose that a man's spiritual interests have no influence over his temporal ones ; or that his religion is not the rule of his conduct. When, therefore, a dispute should arise between the King of Britain and the Pope, a thing which has happened oftener than once, and may happen again, a Papist would be under a spiritual obligation to the Pope, from which nothing of a temporal nature could relieve him ; and to exclude such a person from power in a Protestant state, is not persecution, but a necessary measure of self defence.

Besides, a genuine Papist is not a free agent. He is not at liberty to act according to his own convictions, farther than it may be agreeable to his priest and confessor. His confessor is lord of his conscience, to whom he is obliged, under pain of being held guilty of mortal sin, to reveal his most secret thoughts. Depending upon his ghostly father for the forgiveness of his sins, and what are called the consolations of his religion, without which he must live without comfort, and die without hope, he must of necessity conduct himself, in every respect, so as to stand upon good terms with his priest. If intrusted with power in a Protestant country, he must exert himself to promote the interest of the holy church ; that is, the interest of the court and see of Rome. Every priest is under a solemn oath to do this, to the utmost of his power : and how could he do it better, than by using the influence which he might possess over the consciences of men in power, if any of his penitents were in that situation ? I say, then, it is not persecution to exclude such persons from places of power and trust ; because they have not power over their own actions ; they have resigned themselves to the will of others ; and are, therefore, not in a situation to legislate and administer justice. There are three parties ; themselves, their priests, and the public at large : they are the slaves of the second, and cannot safely be entrusted with the interests of the third. Those who legislate and administer the laws of men, ought to be independent of men, and free from all human influence. This a Papist cannot be : he wants an indispensable qualification for a public trust ; and it is not persecution to exclude him from it, any more than it is persecution to exclude the deaf and dumb from parliament.





